
This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

<http://books.google.com>



44. 129.

SACRAMENTAL INSTRUCTION.

**PRINTED BY
L. SEELEY, THAMES DITTON, SURREY.**

SACRAMENTAL INSTRUCTION.

BY THE REV. C. BRIDGES, M.A.
VICAR OF OLD NEWTON.

SEELEY, BURNSIDE AND SEELEY,
FLEET STREET, LONDON,
MDCCCXLIV.



PREFACE.

THE Writer had no original intention of obtruding upon the Church his opinions on the various and important discussions of Sacramental Theology. What had been so much better done by others needed no confirmation from himself. But being called again to revise his work on 'The Christian Ministry' for a New Edition, he was naturally led to a more full consideration of the Chapter on the Sacraments,¹ as involving a subject of special moment and interest. And as his proposed enlargements soon exceeded the prescribed limits of his Book, he was induced to pledge himself to give them in a separate form ; still preserving the Title of the Chapter, which in the New Edition has mainly formed the germ of this little work. He

¹ Part v. Ch. v.

gives this explanation in passing, of the Title of the present Volume, which might otherwise have appeared to bear an *ex cathedra* character; than which nothing would be more revolting to his feelings, as nothing was further from his intentions.

This enlarged publication was suggested to the Writer's mind from his desire to divest his Original Work of any controversial character, and to present to his Brethren—so far as he might be able—a comprehensive view of the whole subject. One further consideration had its weight in the decision—his wish to add his Protest against that deadly Sacramental error pervading the Church—‘a component part of a system, which,’ as Bishop McIlvaine most truly observes, ‘cannot be dreaded too seriously, or resisted too earnestly.’² With this protest however, he was most anxious to guard against the revulsion to the opposite error, which has been seriously hurtful to the efficiency of Christian Ministration.

Had the controversy involved only questions of rites and ceremonies, it might have been left as a profitable exercise of mutual forbearance.³ But

² Charge to the Diocese of Ohio, 1843, p. 8. Reprinted by Messrs. Seeley and Burnside. The Writer commends this valuable Charge to the consideration of his brethren.

³ Rom. xiv. 1—6.

the vital principles of the Gospel—the foundations of the faith—are threatened; so that the plain duty is to “contend earnestly, and to give place by subjection—no—not for an hour, “that the truth of the Gospel might continue with us.”⁴

The Writer would earnestly warn his younger brethren not to tamper with these unscriptural principles. They may be cherishing seeds without due forethought of what the ripening harvest will be. These principles are too nearly allied to Dissent, (*sui generis* indeed) to make us *sound churchmen*. The Church to which we have subscribed, is not that either of the Fathers or of the Laudean era—but of the *Reformation*. And ‘from these principles—if any such there be’—the Leaders of this school have professed their bold determination to ‘recede more and more.’⁵ ‘They are not only divergent, but contrary to the patristic system. It is impossible for the same mind to sympathize with both.’⁶ ‘The articles’ they conceive to be ‘the product of an uncatholic age.’⁷ ‘The Breviary and Missal have a claim in a far greater degree to our deference than the Prayer-book.’⁸ The Church was lowered at the Reformation from her ancient

⁴ Jude 3. Gal. ii. 5.

⁵ Article on Jewel in *British Critic*, 1841.

⁶ Froude’s *Remains*, Vol. iii. Pref. p. xxxiii.

⁷ Tract 90. *Introd.* p. 4. ⁸ Froude’s *Remains*, i. 402.

and proper place as the king's daughter into the condition of a slave at a table, where she should preside.' ⁹ 'Her general services are characterized by a peculiar tone of sadness and humiliation—the language of those who have fallen away from the richer inheritance.'¹⁰ Her Baptismal formulary is shorn and 'unhappily maimed.'¹¹ 'Her Communion service is a judgment upon the Church ; the mutilation of the sacred and most precious monument of the Apostles—'the canon of the mass,' by a translation of which it would be much better to replace it.' ¹² Verily such disloyalty to our honoured Mother might make one's heart weep in sadness. Are these the statements of *sound Churchmen* ? Are these principles to attach us to the Church, and not rather to encourage either unsettled abidance within her pale, or separation from it ? Many conscientious Dissenters have expressed their objections to the Church in language less strong and decided than that which has proceeded from these Tractarians, who have subscribed to her Articles, who "eat of her bread,

⁹ See quotations from British Critic in Bishop of Winchester's Charge, App. ix.

¹⁰ Tracts lxxxvi. p. 66. ¹¹ Dr Pusey's Tracts pp. 242, 266.

¹² Dr. Faussett's Sermon on the Revival of Popery p. 23, and Newman's Letter to Faussett, p. 43.

and lift up their heels against her.”¹³ This is indeed Dissent within her walls ; in what direction—Dr. Wiseman plainly demonstrates ; while he not less truly declares the substance to mean—not objections to minor or insulated blemishes, but *general dissatisfaction at the system of the Anglican Church*.¹⁴

If these principles fail to make *sound Churchmen*, much less will they make *sound and effective Ministers of the Gospel*. The Apostle’s mode of “establishing the heart is *with grace*,”—that is, with a clear Scriptural apprehension of the great doctrine of the Gospel. Here the attempt is made to establish “*by meats*”—that is—by external ordinances and ceremonials, which the Apostle—in exhibiting the contrast—declares “have not profited them that have been occupied therein.”¹⁵ We value a chaste and decent ceremonial—holy ordinances—specially Divinely-instituted Sacraments. But the more *we value* them, the more care is needed (such is the perversity of the human judgment !) lest we *overvalue* them. Some of us indeed may need a more just and elevated estimate of their real value. But let us ever be careful—with our judicious Hooker—to connect high views of Christian

¹³ Ps. xli. 9.
17, 21, 40, 41.

¹⁴ Letter to Earl of Shrewsbury, pp. 16,
¹⁵ Heb. xiii. 9.

ordinances with sound views of Christian doctrine ; else will the balance preponderate on the wrong side. Forms, unduly exalted, dethrone our Divine Master from his supremacy, bring the palsy of formality upon our souls, and a withering blast upon our Ministry. The quickening Spirit is contravened in his own honoured office of " glorifying Christ." ¹⁶ He restrains his influence, and withdraws from us ; and " the things that remain," for want of his Divine " strengthening, are ready to die." ¹⁷

The Writer however, having given his testimony, has no intention of entering into further disputation ; though he will gladly correct in a future edition, should it be called for, any inaccuracies into which he may have inadvertently fallen.

¹⁶ John xvi. 14.

¹⁷ Rev. iii. 2.

Old Newton Vicarage,
May 24, 1844.

CONTENTS.

CHAP.	PAGE
I. THE NATURE OF SACRAMENTS - -	1
II. THE MEDIUM OF SACRAMENTAL EFFI- CACY - - - - -	22
III. SACRAMENTAL ERRORS—ERRORS OF EXCESS - - - - -	29
IV. SACRAMENTAL ERRORS—ERRORS OF DEFECT - - - - -	56
V. BAPTISM - - - - -	65
VI. THE LORD'S SUPPER - - -	91
VII. CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS - -	112

SACRAMENTAL INSTRUCTION.

CHAP. I.

THE NATURE OF SACRAMENTS.

THE Dispensation of the Sacraments must be considered as one of the most important parts of our Ministry. For its efficient administration, however, we need sound and Scriptural apprehensions of their nature and uses, of the privileges and obligations connected with them, and of the medium by which their grace is received and applied. Our Homily well states the distinctness of the ordinance—‘ In Prayer we beg at God’s hands all such things as otherwise we cannot obtain. In the Sacraments he embraceth, and offereth himself to be embraced of us.’¹

In opening a more full discussion, we advert to

¹ Homily on Prayer and Sacraments.

their primary object, which is, to exhibit Christ in all the rich treasures of grace and salvation. For 'Christ being taken away'—as Bishop Davenant admirably observes—'there remaineth nothing in the Sacraments but an empty shew.'² In this view we cannot but acknowledge the full love of our God in these gracious ordinances—so fraught with encouragement to our faith—so eminently conducive to our holiness. For while they bring the Great Redeemer vividly before our eyes, they at the same time 'serve as bonds of obedience to God, strict obligations to the mutual exercise of Christian charity, provocations to godliness, preservations from sin, memorials of the principal benefits of Christ.'³ It is indeed a melancholy instance of the perverseness of the human mind, that these enriching blessings should from their misuse or neglect be so unfruitful to the church—that these ordinances—intended to cement the body of Christ in one fellowship⁴—should be the matter of ceaseless controversy and division. For Hooker's statement is beyond question—that 'Sacraments are more diversely interpreted and disputed of, than any other part of religion besides.'⁵

In order to arrive at some accurate view of the subject, we will expound the comprehensive definition of a Sacrament, which our Church has

² On Col. ii. 11.

⁴ 1 Cor. x. 17, xii. 13.

³ Hooker, Book v. lvii. 2.

⁵ Hooker ut supra.

given for the instruction of her younger members. She explains it to be an 'outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us; ordained by Christ himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and as a pledge to assure us thereof.' ⁶

The Ordination of Christ himself—the Divine Head of the Church—is justly laid as the ground of this ordinance. Who besides has the prerogative to ordain?—"Go ye, and teach all nations, baptizing them—This do in remembrance of me"⁷—here is his "image and superscription" stamped broad and clear upon the Sacraments of the Church. And so sacred is their authority and entireness, that to add to their number, and to violate their integrity, is the high treason of altering the royal seal—the defilement of setting "up our threshold by God's threshold, and our post by God's posts."⁸ The Church indeed rightly claims the liberty of prescribing the mode and circumstantialia of their celebration.⁹ But she never places her own requisitions upon a Divine basis. She maintains the strictest regard to the spirit of the Apostolic rules,¹⁰ and carefully pre-

⁶ Catechism. The definition in the Westminster Confession is drawn up in this mould, expressing clearly the ground of the ordinance, and its threefold use.

⁷ Matt. xxviii. 19. Luke xxii. 19.

⁸ Ezekiel xliii. 7. See the clear credentials on the Sacramental commission in John i. 33. 1 Cor. xi. 23. Compare Hooker, B. v. lxi. 5.

⁹ Art. xxx.

¹⁰ 1 Cor. xiv. 26, 40.

serves both the substance and form of the elements, and the representation of the inestimable blessings which they shadow forth.

Our definition next proceeds to the more distinct description of a Sacrament, considering it *as a sign—a means—and a pledge or seal—of grace.*

It is obviously *a sign, both of the profession of grace, and of the grace which we profess. In the first view—it is the sign of our admission into the visible Church separated from the world. “The sign of circumcision” distinguished the Jews from the Heathen around them;*¹¹ *and the Christian Sacraments knit us together in one visible body and fellowship.*¹² Thus the Apostle speaks of the whole body of Christians in evident allusion to one sacrament—“By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body,” and in allusion to the other Sacrament—“have been all made to drink into one Spirit.”¹³ Again in similar reference to the latter ordinance—“We being many are one bread and one body; for we are all partakers of one bread.”¹⁴ Thus Augustine speaks of Baptism as ‘the Sacrament of Christian fellowship.’¹⁵ Elsewhere of both the Sacraments—‘God hath gathered together the fellowship of a new people by Sacraments, very few in number, very

¹¹ Rom. iv. 11.

¹² Acts ii. 37—46.

¹³ 1 Cor. xii. 13. Compare Eph. iv. 5. ¹⁴ 1 Cor. x. 17.

¹⁵ De nat. et orig. anim. Ep. 28, quoted by Bullinger. Sermons on the Sacraments, p. 194.

easy in observance, very excellent in signification—as is Baptism, consecrated in the name of the Trinity, and the communion of his own body and blood.’¹⁶ In this view our Church considers the Sacraments as ‘the badges or tokens of Christian men’s profession—a sign of profession, and a mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened’¹⁷—as Hooker speaks—‘a mark of distinction, to separate God’s own from strangers.’¹⁸

But they are not only signs of our profession, but of *that ‘inward and spiritual grace,’ which gives life to our profession.*¹⁹ They are ‘visible signs of invisible grace.’²⁰ Indeed they may be called ‘the visible words,’²¹ as representing to our eyes what the word speaks to our ears. ‘In the word we have the promises of God. In the Sacraments we see them.’²² The striking affinity of the signs to the blessings which they represent is a gracious manifestation of Divine wisdom not sufficiently admired; exhibiting as they do with

¹⁶ Ep. 118, ad Januar. Compare De Doctr. Christ. lib. iii. c. 9: also Contra Faustum, Lib. xix. c. 11, quoted by Bullinger, ut supra p. 119.

¹⁷ Art. xxv. xxvii.

¹⁸ Book v. lvii. 2. ¹⁹ Art. xxv. xxvii. Compare Catechism.

²⁰ Homily on Prayer and Sacraments. Hooker v. l. 3. This is also the Definition of the Council of Trent. Sess. xiii. c. iii. ‘Holy Signs,’ Homily ibid. Compare Foxe’s Acts and Monum. vi. 320.

²¹ Augustine calls them ‘verba visibilia.’ Hooker’s MS. note, Book v. lvii. 3. (Keble’s Edit.) Bullinger calls them ‘speechless witnesses,’—as contrasted with the Word—‘a speaking witness.’ Sermons, p. 101.

²² Bishop Jewel on the Sacraments, Ed. 1611, p. 261.

wonderful skill the precious blessings of the Gospel, as if pictured before our eyes, so as that at one glance our senses forcibly apprehend them.

They are not therefore natural or arbitrary, but instituted, signs—not signs of memorial, but of exhibition and conveyance. In this view they are far from being mere naked representations. ‘It greatly offendeth’—says our great writer—‘that some, when they labour to show the use of the holy Sacraments, assign to them no end but merely to teach the mind by other sources that, which the word doth teach by hearing. For where the word of God may be heard, which teacheth with much more expedition and more full explication any thing we have to learn; if all the benefit we reap by Sacraments be instruction, they which at all times have opportunity of using the better means for that purpose, will surely hold the worse in less estimation. There is of Sacraments undoubtedly some other more excellent and heavenly use.’²³

This ‘more excellent and heavenly use of Sacraments’ our Church fully acknowledges in her definition of them, *as a means whereby we receive*

²³ Hooker v. lvii. 1. Bishop Hooper animadverts strongly upon this cold and barren Sacramental statement.—‘Early Writings.’ Parker’s Society Edition, pp. 199, 399. Fathers of English Church, v. 462. Melancthon also sharply rebukes this error in the Anabaptists of his time. On Rom. iv. 11, 1 Cor. xi. 23. We find a writer in the next century rebuking the Anabaptists on the same ground.—Zepperi de Sacramentis, Herbornæ 1606, pp. 246, 546.

the grace given unto us. And a rich means they must be, linked as they are with the grand blessings of the Gospel to the very end of our course. *The initial Sacrament* is connected *with our Regeneration*:—"We are born of water and of the Spirit."²⁴ *With our justification*:—"Be baptized every one of you for the remission of sins—Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins—Buried with him by baptism into death. As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. Let us draw near—having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water."²⁵ *With our fellowship with the body of Christ*:—"By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body. One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism."²⁶ *With the full promise of the Spirit*:—"Be baptized, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."²⁷ *With our justification and sanctification combined*:—"But *ye are washed*—but ye are sanctified—but ye are justified."²⁸ *With our final and complete sanctification*:—"Christ gave himself for his church, that he might sanctify and cleanse us with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing."²⁹ *With our eternal*

²⁴ John iii. 5.

²⁵ Acts ii. 38, xxii. 16. Rom. vi. 4. Col. ii. 12. Gal. iii. 27. Heb. x. 22.

²⁶ 1 Cor. xii. 13. Eph. iv. 5.

²⁷ Acts ii. 38.

²⁸ 1 Cor. vi. 11.

²⁹ Eph. v. 25—27.

salvation:—"God hath saved us through the washing of regeneration. Baptism doth now save us."³⁰ In *reference to the commemorative Sacrament*—"The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we, being many, are one bread, and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread."³¹

We shall presently advert to the precise mode and extent of this Sacramental connexion with such inestimable blessings. Meanwhile, since God does not accredit empty signs, we may assume the fact, as some evidence, that 'these heavenly ceremonies, which God hath sanctified, and ordained to be administered in his Church,'³² are exhibited as a mean of rich and special grace.

Individual instances fully corroborate this statement. Our Divine Master condescended to receive strength through the channel of Baptism.³³ The baptized Apostle was similarly strengthened by this holy ordinance.³⁴ The baptized eunuch—the jailor also—"went on their way rejoicing."³⁵

³⁰ Titus iii. 5. 1 Peter iii. 21.

³¹ 1 Cor. x. 16, 17.

³² Hooker. B. V. lvii. 3.

³³ Luke iii. 21, 22, iv. 1.

³⁴ Acts ix. 18—20.—Both this example, and that of our Lord, illustrate the minute Scriptural accuracy of our Church—"Faith is confirmed and grace increased"—not by the innate power of the Sacrament—but '*by virtue of prayer to God.*'—Art. xxvii. Compare Acts ix. 11, xxii. 16. Luke iii. 21.

³⁵ Ibid. viii. 38, 39, xvi. 33, 34. Compare Cyprian's description of the comfort of his Baptism quoted at full length by

How largely the Pentecostal converts were refreshed by *both* Sacraments, their brief history fully testifies.³⁶

In strict harmony with the Scriptural testimony, our Church defines Sacraments generally—that ‘they be not only badges and tokens of Christian men’s profession, but rather *effectual* signs of grace, and of God’s good will towards us, *by the which he doth work invisibly in us.*’³⁷ In her Homily she speaks of them as ‘visible signs, where-with is annexed the promise of free forgiveness of our sins, and of our holiness and joining in Christ.’³⁸ Hence in her Baptismal Services she pleads for these high privileges to be vouchsafed to the infant or adult recipient of the ordinance, “as the matter may require.” In her Communion Service she acknowledges the holy enjoyment and realized interest derived from the Eucharistic Sacrament.

The soundest expositors of our true Church principles fully accredit the Sacraments as *means of grace*. ‘Although’—says Hooker, ‘we make not Baptism a cause of grace, yet the grace which is given with Baptism doth so far depend upon

Mr. Faber. Prim. Doctr. of Regeneration, pp. 37—39. Milner also gives it as ‘an instance of regeneration in Baptism.’ Ch. Hist. i. 326, note. It is indeed an interesting document—though perhaps with some savour of that superstitious phraseology, which is too often the characteristic of Patristic statements.

³⁶ Acts ii. 41—47.

³⁷ Art. xxv.

³⁸ Homily on Prayer and Sacraments.

the outward Sacrament, that God will have it embraced, not only as a sign and token of what we receive, *but also as an instrument whereby we receive grace*; because Baptism is a Sacrament, which God hath instituted in his Church, to the end that they which receive the same might thereby be incorporated into Christ'—as he explains it—for complete acceptance and quickening life.³⁹ Bishop Jewel gives a similar and decisive judgment on both Sacraments—'We affirm that Christ doth truly and presently give himself in his Sacraments—in Baptism, that we may put him on; and in his Supper, that we may eat him by faith and in spirit, and may have everlasting life from his cross and blood. And we say, that is not done slightly or coldly, *but in very deed and truly.*'⁴⁰

We have now exhibited Sacramental privilege in all its fulness—as warranted by Scripture testimony, and as confirmed by our most approved Church authorities. Baptism (of which the detail is more extended than of the other Sacrament) has been seen to be connected with all the primary blessings of the gospel; and *that*, not for the moment of its administration, but extending

³⁹ Book v. lx. 2. Compare Rom. vi. 3, 4, Col. ii. 12, 'It is beyond controversy, that we put on Christ in Baptism, and that we are baptized with that end (*hâc lege*) that we should be one with him.' Calvin on Rom. vi. 3.

⁴⁰ Defence of Apology.

to the last moment of life. Is then every recipient of the ordinance (according to this detail) regenerated—justified—admitted into the true fellowship of the Church—gifted with the promise of the Spirit—sanctified, and saved? We fully accord with Archbishop Ussher's mind—that 'though God has ordained these outward means for the conveyance of inward grace to our souls; yet there is no necessity, that we should tie the work of God's Spirit to the Sacraments more than to the Word.'⁴¹ The blessing is not given to the external administration of the ceremony, but to the right reception of the ordinance. Its effective interest is vouchsafed according to the capacity of the recipient. In the adult it would be more visible. But in the infant it would not be less real. The instrument is not the apprehension—but *the application*—of the great Atonement. And *this* the Divine Spirit can—and we doubt not—does—work invisibly *according to his own will*, when the blessing is pleaded and claimed in believing prayer. *Where the grace is thus conveyed, to the infant* the ordinance *is the means* of justification. The *supplanted* blessing of remission with all its attendant privileges is granted; and by the spiritual grace of the Sacrament 'the child of

⁴¹ Body of Divinity—Dr. Robinson's edition, p. 499. 'That Spirit which works by means, will not be tied to means.' Bishop Hall. Epist. Dec. v. 4. See Calvin on Eph. v. 26.

wrath is hereby made a child of grace.’⁴² *The adult* however comes in the profession of that faith, which, if sincere, has already been the instrument of his justification. To him therefore *the ordinance* is primarily a *seal*—confirming and establishing him in his privilege.

That this spiritual profession was the prerequisite for Baptism, appears from the uniform testimony of Scripture. Even John’s baptism was preceded by the confession of sins, and connected with faith; being, like the Pentecostal baptism, “for the remission of sins.”⁴³ Our Lord’s declaration in the Gospel commission was—“*He that believeth and is baptized*”⁴⁴—The Apostle’s exhortations were to the same purport—collectively—“*Repent, and be baptized*”⁴⁵—individually—“*If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest.*”⁴⁶—Thus the Pentecostal converts, “who *gladly received the word*, were baptized.”—So at Samaria—“those *that believed Philip* preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God.”—At Corinth also—“Many, hearing the word, *believed*, and were baptized.”⁴⁷ Thus—as Hooker says—‘the first thing required of him, which standeth for admission into Christ’s

⁴² Catechism with the Baptismal Service.

⁴³ Mark i. 4, 6. John i. 28—31, with Acts ii. 38.

⁴⁴ Mark xvi. 16.

⁴⁵ Acts ii. 38.

⁴⁶ Ib. viii. 37. Compare 1 Pet. iii. 21.

⁴⁷ Ib. ii. 41; viii. 12; xviii. 8.

family, is belief.’⁴⁸ The same requisition was made in the Primitive Church. Justin Martyr (early enough to be a contemporary of St. John) speaks of the catechumens in the early Church—‘Who shall have been *fully convinced* of the truths delivered to them, and acknowledged their determination to live according to them—These’—says he—‘are ordered *with fasting and prayer to seek for the forgiveness of their past sins*—we ourselves fasting and praying with them. *Then* they are brought where there is water, and regenerated in the same mode as we ourselves have been.’⁴⁹ Our own Church has strictly followed out this principle. Those whom she admits to adult baptism are those, who—professedly, at least—‘*truly repent, and come to Christ by faith.*’⁵⁰ Her Article¹ defines the effect of baptism to be the *confirmation of faith*—plainly implying the actual presence of faith—consequently of a *justified* state. It speaks also of the *increase of grace*, similarly intimating the life of grace—that is, a *regenerated* state—both pre-requisites to the sacraments. To the same purport Cranmer speaks—‘*When we believe in Christ, and are baptized, then we be born again, and are made the children of God. All these things doth baptism work in us, when we believe in Christ.* And therefore Christ saith,

⁴⁸ Book v. lxiii. 1.

⁵⁰ Service of Adult Baptism.

⁴⁹ See his Apology.

¹ Art. xxvii.

“ He that will believe and be baptized shall be saved.” Baptism worketh forgiveness of sin. It delivereth from death and power of the devil. It giveth salvation and everlasting life to *all them that believe*, as the words of Christ’s promise do evidently witness.’²

Where therefore the first blessing has been received previous to the Sacrament, the ordinance is applied primarily as *a seal* of further and more enlarged privilege.

This brings us to complete our definition of the nature of the Sacrament—as *a pledge to assure us of the grace given to us*.

A seal is an instrument of confirmation—a solemn attestation to a promise or covenant—a signature to a deed of conveyance—confirming the privilege to all that are interested in them. Thus—as Bishop Jewel admirably expounds the subject—‘ Christ hath ordained Sacraments, that by them he might set before our eyes the mysteries of our salvation; and might more strongly *confirm* the faith which we have in his blood, and might seal his grace in our hearts. As princes’

² Catechism, 1548. This, we are aware, is not Cranmer’s production, but a course of Lectures for the Young, originally written in German, and translated into Latin by Justus Jonas, and from thence into English under Cranmer’s authority and superintendence for the same use in the English Reformation. See the Prefatory Epistle to King Edward VI. It must therefore be considered as the expression of Cranmer’s sentiments at that time. Some mists of Popery yet remain; but upon the whole, the statements are clear and scriptural.

seals confirm and warrant their deeds and charters; so do the Sacraments witness to our conscience, that God's promises are true, and shall continue for ever. Thus doth God make known his secret purpose to his Church. First—he *declareth* his mercy by his word. Then he *sealeth it*, and *assureth it* by his Sacraments.³

One object therefore of the Sacraments is, to '*seal, as it were, in our hearts*, the promises of God.'⁴ For though his word is as sure as his oath, and *in itself* needs no further warrant, yet in condescension to our infirmities he "hath confirmed it with an oath"⁵—here with *a seal*. Thus if we 'regard the weakness that is in us, the Sacraments are the warrants for the more security of our belief.'⁶ They further operate to fasten Divine truth *generally* on the mind, and impress it upon the heart. In this view they serve—as Hooker has before stated—as 'bonds of obedience to God, provocations to godliness—preservations from sin'⁷—instrumentally keeping us from falling from God.

³ On the Sacraments, p. 261. Comp. Calv. Instit. iv. xv. 1, 2, 14.

⁴ Homily on Prayer and Sacraments.

⁵ Heb. vi. 17.

⁶ Hooker v. lvii. 2. 'God's gift without sealing is sure, as he himself is one without changing. Yet to bear with our infirmity, and to make us more secure of his promise, to his writing and word he has added these outward signs and seals, to establish our faith, and to certify us, that his promise is most certain.' Archbishop Sandys' Sermons, Parker Society Ed. pp. 303, 304.

⁷ Ibid.

But a *seal* is also a public attestation to the truth. To use an illustration of Bishop Hooper—‘The crown does not make the king (who is a king from the cradle) but it publicly confirms his right and title to the crown.’⁸ Thus our Lord’s Baptism did not make him the Son of God. But it accredited Him in this high dignity.⁹ And hence he comes forth from the waters of Jordan (first passing through the furnace of temptation) and enters upon his work with all the glory and power of his Divine credentials.¹⁰ The ordinance was to him, as to many of his people, at once the channel of strength, and the sealing of acceptance. When God established by a Sacrament his covenant with Abraham, “he received *the sign* of circumcision *as a seal* of the righteousness of the faith”—not a means—much less the cause—of his justification, but the open manifestation and *seal* of the privilege before vouchsafed.¹¹ The ordinance similarly applies to his believing children. ‘We are plainly taught of God’—as Hooker reminds us—‘that the seed of faithful parentage is holy from the very birth’¹²—obviously referring to federal holiness—not denying their birth-sin, but asserting their present interest in the covenant of grace. The grace which before was theirs in the

⁸ Early writings of Bishop Hooper, p. 75.

⁹ Luke iii. 21, 22.

¹⁰ Ib. iv. 1—19.

¹¹ Gen. xv. 5, 6. xvii. 9, 10.

¹² Book v lx. 6. Compare Rom. xi. 16, 1 Cor. vii. 14. Scott in loc.

covenant promise, is hereby—when not actually vouchsafed—‘visibly signed and sealed.’¹³ And the prayers of our Church, (like the Collect for Circumcision in the mouth of her circumcised members) are for the full vouchsafement of the *promised blessings*, and of the grace connected with them. The Pentecostal converts were pricked to the heart by Divine influence. Under the same energy they were enabled “gladly to receive the word,”¹⁴ which before they had determinately resisted. They must have been therefore in a state of favour. Their baptism was the seal—not the means—of “the remission of their sins.” The eunuch also, as a believer, was justified by his faith¹⁵ previous to his baptism. His faith, though of so recent a date, was as valid an instrument for the obtaining of the blessing, as if it had been of mature establishment.¹⁶ To him therefore the ordinance was—as to his father Abraham—“a seal of the righteousness of the faith, which he had yet being” unbaptized.¹⁷ And can we doubt what was the state of the Apostle—converted as he was from a bloody persecutor to a humble and praying disciple? Could he be otherwise than in an acceptable—that is—a *justified* state? If so—the real guilt of his sin was “washed away.” His baptism therefore was

¹³ Art. xxvii. with Gen. xvii. 7—10. Acts ii. 39. Comp. Calv. Instit. iv. xv. 20—22. Epist. ad Clauburgum. Op. xiii. pp. 179, 180.

¹⁵ Rom. iii. 28. v. 1.

¹⁴ Acts ii. 37—41.

¹⁶ See 2 Sam. xii. 13.

¹⁷ Acts viii. 37, 38. Rom. iv. 11.

to him all that he wanted—the *seal* of this inestimable blessing, fraught doubtless with enlarged communication, and every way, as we have before remarked, most invigorating to his soul.¹⁸ In like manner the Galatian converts—“baptized into Christ” *on the profession of their faith*—did thus virtually “put on Christ;”¹⁹ and so far as their profession was sincere, they were thus manifested, accepted and established as his faithful people.

In consistency with this diversified but uniform statement, our Church speaks soundly of Baptism, as an ‘instrument, by which, to those *who receive it rightly*, the promises of forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are *visibly signed and sealed.*’²⁰ The identity of the terms—‘baptized or justified—regenerate or baptized’²¹—seems on this Scriptural ground to be without reasonable objection; implying—a general sacramental—but not an inseparable—connection.

As the other Sacrament rests upon the same ground, and is of the same character—a brief notice will be sufficient. “This cup”—spake our

¹⁸ Acts ix. 1—20. xxii. 16.

¹⁹ Gal. iii. 27. See Calvin’s valuable note in loco. Instit. iv. xv. 6. ‘They truly put on Christ, who not only apprehend the sign, but meanwhile are not destitute of the thing itself—in grace and faith. God only knows the mind. We judge by signs and outward profession.’ Marlorate in loco.

²⁰ Art. xxvii.

²¹ Homily on Salvation. Art. ix. Latin.

Lord at the sacred supper—"is my blood of the new Testament"—'representing his blood as shed to make way for the new covenant, *and to ratify it as valid for their benefit*' ²²—not making the covenant more valid in itself, but 'certain sure witnesses, strengthening and confirming our faith' ²³ to apprehend and apply it.—'Sweeter it is unto us than honey'—says Archbishop Sandys; 'where we are certified by this outward Sacrament, of the inward grace, given unto us through his death; where we in him are assured of remission of sins and eternal life. Better food than this thy soul can never feed upon.' ²⁴

While we would strongly protest against the Romish view of the Sacraments, by whomsoever or wheresoever it may be brought out; we feel most anxious not to be deterred by the fear of error from grasping the full compass of the Scriptural statement. It appears to us that some excellent men, and generally sound expositors, are cramped by this natural, though perhaps morbid, apprehension. Even our own godly Bishop Hooper seems to have suffered from this quarter—probably imbibing somewhat of the atmosphere of Zurich from his residence in that place in contact with the Foreign Reformers. His judgment of '*all Sacraments, that they do nothing but signify and*

²² Matt. xxvi. 28. Scott in loco. Comp. Bishop Hopkins, Works, ii. 440.

²³ Art. xxv.

²⁴ Sermons, p. 89.

confirm the thing that they represent'²⁵—comes short of a full apprehension of the ordinance. It is but right however to state, that while Dr. Pusey's extract from his 'Early Writings' is not without just ground of objection on the side of *defect*; yet a reference to his *Later Writings* would bring evidence sufficient to disprove the verdict, that 'in his statement of the Sacraments scarcely a vestige of any spiritual influence remains.'²⁶

Thus far we have endeavoured to set out, what, according to the definition of the Church, and in strict unison with Scripture, forms the sum and substance of a Sacrament. The statements of the Foreign Reformers, as embodied in their public confessions, or as they can be elicited from a careful study of their writings, seem to be marked with some variation; nor do the most sound of them, in the Writer's judgment, come up to the completeness of the Anglican exposition.²⁷

²⁵ Early Writings, p. 208, Compare pp. 76, 211.

²⁶ Tracts on Baptism p. 133. Comp. Bishop Hooper's Confession of the Christian Faith, published four years subsequent. Fathers of the English Church, v. 463.

²⁷ Zuingli's *general* views of Sacraments were very far short of the truth, though some occasional statements may be found of a sounder complexion. He speaks of them as 'signs by which the receiver gives to the Church a pledge of his faith' (Fol. Op. ii. 198; also pp. 202, 204. His most elaborate Treatise, Fid. Christian. Expos. expounds them generally and in detail with little—if any—direct connection with spiritual influence. See Bishop Hall's judgment of his doctrine. (Christian Moderation, Book ii. Rule viii.) Dean Milner's also—(Church History, v. pp. 415, 523.)—Cal-

vin's *systematic* views embraced two parts of the Sacrament—a sign and a seal—omitting the third—a *means*—Instit. iv. xiv. 1. Peter Martyr mainly symbolized with Calvin. Comm. Places. 4. 7. 7—11. 8. 3. Melancthon's judgment was nearly of the same grasp. See on Luke ii. 21. Rom. iv. 11. He passes over Baptism rather slightly on Rom. vi. 4. His views of the Lord's Supper underwent a gradual change. See Scott's Continuation of Milner. ii. 110, 245. iii. 98. Bucer's were perhaps more full. See on Baptism—'Scripta Anglicana—De vi et efficac. Baptismi'—a Treatise occasionally quoted by Dr. Pusey. Comp. also on Matt. xix. His expositions of the other Sacrament have often some tincture of the Lutheran error. Yet the confession of the Brethren of Strasburg drawn up by him, and presented to the Diet of Augsburg, is truly Scriptural. He appears to have endeavoured to take a middle ground between Zuingli and Luther. Milner's Ch. History. iv. ult. v. 416. Scott's Contin. i. 85. Bullinger's Decades had the imprimatur of the English Convocation of 1586, and were published the succeeding year by Royal Authority. The Sermons on the Sacraments extracted from them have lately been edited by the Norrisian Professor of Divinity at Cambridge. Dr. Pusey quotes with great delight Luther's glowing exposition of Baptismal Privilege (on Gal. iii. 27.); though doubtless erroneously conceiving him to regard the opus operatum of his Popish 'Baptism as the source of his spiritual life in Christ.' Tracts on Baptism. pp. 28, 29. 'Would that they'—he exclaims in another place—'who extol Luther's clearness on the doctrine of justification by faith, would lay to heart their Master's Teaching as to justification through Baptism!' (Ib. p. 122, 3rd Ed.) But what will the Dr. say to another quotation from Luther? '*Ita Baptismus neminem justificat, nec ulli prodest; sed fides in verbum promissionis, cui additur baptismus: hæc enim justificat, et implet id quod baptismus significat.*' Opera i. 272. Edit. Jencæ. After all however, Luther's Sacramental statements do not appear entitled to full weight. As both Sacraments stand upon the same principles, the errors on one would probably affect the clearness of apprehension of the other. Apart from Luther's unscriptural dogma, we find him—even after he had boldly avowed grand Protestant truth—reducing the seven Sacraments to *three*—Baptism—Penitence—and the Lord's Supper—See his celebrated Tract—one of his first thunder-bolts against Popery: De Captiv. Babylonica. Eccles.

CHAP. II.

THE MEDIUM OF SACRAMENTAL EFFICACY.

WE have already adverted to the only effectual application of the Sacraments. But this part of our subject is far too important to be cursorily dismissed. There is indeed a wide difference between these Ordinances, as viewed in themselves, and as respects their benefit to us. However rich the storehouse may be, a mere external exhibition will unlock not one particle of its riches for our interest. 'The faithful' says Bishop Jewel—'receive the fruit and comfort by the Sacraments, which the wicked and ungodly neither consider nor receive.'²⁸ Simon Magus partook of one Sacrament²⁹—and probably Judas of the other³⁰—with "a savour of death" to their souls. For this unworthy participation involves not only the loss of the Sacramental blessing, but a most guilty

²⁸ On the Sacraments, p. 284.

²⁹ Acts viii. 13—23.

³⁰ Luke xxii. 19—22. See Bullinger's Sermons pp. 271, 272. Dr. Pusey, however, speaks of Judas '*receiving the body of the Lord*,' in direct contradiction to the title and language of Art. xxix. Tracts on Baptism, p. 236.

and aggravated sin.³¹ Our Church therefore—while she clearly admits the *unworthy administration* as no bar³²—no less strongly insists on *the worthy reception* as an indispensable means, to the conveyance of the blessing. ‘The Sacraments’—she declares—‘were ordained, that we should *duly use them*. And in such only as *worthily receive the same*, they have a wholesome effect and operation. But they that receive them unworthily, purchase to themselves damnation, as St. Paul saith.’³³ Indeed, to presume that they would work alike—whether they be improved or profaned—is to suppose, that God would alike accept faith and unbelief; repentance and impenitence; sincerity and hypocrisy—a supposition no less dishonourable to his name, than contravening

³¹ 1 Cor. xi. 27–29.—Of the other Sacrament ‘St. Augustine saith, Whoso receiveth baptism unworthily, receiveth his judgment, and not his health.’—Bishop Jewell’s reply to Harding’s answer, p. 284.

³² Art. xxvi. This formed one of Bishop Ridley’s enquiries to his Clergy, Works, p. 531. Melancthon gives this reason—‘because their Ministry is not the Ministry of the individuals but of the Church, on Matt. xx. 1. &c. Full of solemn weight are Hooker’s words, ‘—Evil Ministers of good things are as torches, a light to others, a waste to none but themselves alone; and the foulness of their hands can neither any whit impair the virtues, nor stain the glory, of the mysteries of Christ.’ v. lxii. 10. Cyprian with his African Council seems to have taken the other side of the question. But—as Milner observes—‘It is the voice of good sense, as well as of the Church of England, that the efficacy of a Sacrament rightly administered, depends not on the character of him that ministers it.’ Ch. Hist. i. 443. Hooker, B. iii. i. 9. viii. vi. 14. Bullinger’s Sermons, pp. 138–140. Calvin’s Instit. Lib. iv. c. xv. 16, 17. Op. xiii. 407.

³³ Art. xxv.

his own rule, expressly given to *preserve* the purity of his worship :—" Them that honour me I will honour ; and they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed." ³⁴ The Sacraments present the blessings of the Gospel to all, though in the vast multitude of cases ineffectually. But to the faithful recipient, they convey into his very bosom the blessings which they exhibit. 'Christ promiseth to be found in the Sacrament'—said good Bishop Latimer—"when he is sought *with a faithful heart.*" ³⁵ The unbeliever is destitute of the hand, by which alone he could receive and apply the treasure to himself.

Thus 'is faith'—as Bishop Davenant observes—"the instrument, by the help and assistance of which, Sacramental benefits are apprehended and possessed. Their salutary efficacy"—the Bishop adds in reference to Baptism (equally true in respect to both Sacraments) 'depends upon faith.' ³⁶ Indeed seldom are they mentioned without some reference more or less direct to this Divine principle. The Apostle's Baptismal washing was connected with the act of faith ; *calling on the name of the Lord.* ³⁷ The "putting on of Christ" by the Galatian professors was linked with the privilege of adoption received "*by faith.*" ³⁸ As Bishop Beveridge remarks—adverting to or expounding this text—"Such *as apply to themselves by faith* what

³⁴ 1 Sam. ii. 30.

³⁵ Sermon preached on St. John Evangelist's Day. 1552.

³⁶ On Col. ii. 12.

³⁷ Acts xxiii. 16.

³⁸ Gal. iii. 26. 27.

is sealed in the Sacraments by God, are made partakers of Christ and all the benefits of his death and passion.’³⁹ “The washing of water is *by the word*”—the word applied by faith. ‘For’ as Calvin justly observes—‘what else are Sacraments, but seals of the word?’⁴⁰ If we are buried with Christ in baptism, we are risen with him from this burial *through the faith* of the operation of God.”⁴¹ The “Baptism that doth now save us” is distinctly stated to be—“*not* the putting away of the filth of the flesh”—the mere external ceremony—“but the answer of a good conscience towards God”—*the act and confession of faith*.⁴² If the unworthy participation of the holy supper be—“not discerning the Lord’s body;”⁴³ the right reception must be that intelligent faith, which discerns the substance, the end, and the blessing of the ordinance.

Our Church therefore Scripturally decides, that to such alone as rightly, worthily, *and with faith* receive the Sacrament, it is a partaking of the body

³⁹ On Art. xxv. ⁴⁰ Eph. v. 26. and Calvin in loco. Marlorate Ib. ‘Non quia dicitur, *sed quia creditur*’—is Augustine’s exposition, quoted—and therefore accredited—by Cranmer. On the Sacrament, ii. 12. ⁴¹ Col. ii. 12.

⁴² 1 Pet. iii. 21—with Acts viii. 37. Rom. x. 9, 10. ‘True Baptism standeth not so much in washing of the body, as in the faith of the heart.’ Bishop Jewell on the Sacraments, p. 266. ‘It is not the water’ (says Bishop Hall alluding to 1 Pet. iii. 21.) ‘but the faith. For who takes Baptism without a full faith—says Jerome—takes the water, takes not the Spirit. Baptism therefore without faith cannot save, and by faith doth save him.’ Epist. Dec. v. 4. ⁴³ 1 Cor. xi. 29.

of Christ.⁴⁴ The adult comes to Baptism with personal—the infant with proxy—faith. Whatever the Sovereignty of God may work according to his own pleasure, it is clear, that all the promises are made to faith ; without which we have no warrant to ask or to expect a blessing. In fact—if the Sacrament be “the seal of the righteousness of faith” ;⁴⁵ obviously it can only be applied in the exercise of faith. Simon Magus was baptized in hypocrisy, and was hardened in his iniquity. The baptized eunuch (as if by juxta-position to make the contrast more striking) was invigorated in his Christian course.⁴⁶ Indeed, if ‘all the vitality of the Sacraments is from Christ,’⁴⁷ how can unbelievers ever draw life from them ? ‘It is therefore’—as Bishop Hopkins most truly remarks—‘only faith, as fixed on Christ the Mediator, that can make this ordinance (the Lord’s Supper) beneficial to us, either as to its signifying or as to its sealing office. Without

⁴⁴ Art. xxviii. xxix. Mr. Palmer conceives that ‘our Church regards this as the most pious and probable opinion’ (Treatise on the Church, i. 527.)—a feeble and indecisive judgment, very different from the firm and undoubted judgment of her Article. The mild Melancthon speaks of the error of using the Sacraments without faith as—*horrendus abusus*. On Matt. xxvi. 17. Yet it is important to remember, ‘that the unbelieving do not, by rejecting the promises there offered to them, thereby make the Sacraments to lose their proper force and nature.’ Nowell’s Catechism in Bishop Randolph’s Enchir. Theol. p. 215. Compare Cranmer on Sacrament, Lib. i. 5. iv. 3.

⁴⁵ Rom. iv. 11.

⁴⁶ Acts viii. 21—39. ⁴⁷ Bishop Davenant, ut supra. Comp. Ussher’s Body of Divinity, p. 502.

faith, the administration is no better than a dumb shew, without any signification at all.' Speaking afterwards of the value of Sacramental faith—he concludes—'It is faith that saves you; and therefore this faith, that seals unto you salvation, if you believe, seals effectually. For it seals to you, that that shall be done, if you believe, which your believing will certainly do.'⁴⁸

Indeed we cannot but bless God for the singular wisdom, which guided the general statements of our Reformers on this important subject. They took up their position in the true mean between Rationalism and Romanism. They expounded high and glowing views of Sacramental grace. But they avoided the Patristic and Romish error, by grounding it on the promise of the covenant, and linking it with the instrumental agency of faith. We need only refer to the Baptismal service; where the prayers are little more than the promises taken hold on by faith; and the exhortation encourages an undoubting confidence, grounded upon the manifested work and love of the Saviour. We are aware indeed, that statements have been produced from their writings, on the side of exaggerated views of the Sacraments. But we are persuaded, that a careful comparison will exhibit these statements, as connected with the grand principles of the Gospel, and—as we shall afterwards show⁴⁹—with a more

⁴⁸ Works, ii: 434, 444.

⁴⁹ Chapt. vii.

precise limitation. Nor must it be forgotten, that they are applied to *the whole ordinance*—not to the bare external ceremony—reminding us, with our Homily, ‘that faith is a necessary instrument in all these holy ceremonies;’ for that, as St. Paul saith, “without faith it is impossible to please God.”⁵⁰ Indeed to insist upon the efficacy of the Sacraments without this necessary mean, is ‘basely to bind ourselves to the elements and the creatures’¹—to make the ordinances matter of idolatrous dependence rather than of warranted scriptural improvement—as if the Sacrament itself gave and did every thing by its innate grace.

⁵⁰ Homily on Sacrament, Part i. Take an example from Cranmer, who perhaps may be considered to have spoken most strongly on the subject of the Sacraments. Speaking of baptism—‘Some will say, ‘How can water work such great things?’ To whom I answer—That it is not the water that doeth these things, but the almighty word of God (which is knit and joined to the water) *and faith*, which receiveth God’s word and promise. For *without the word of God, water is water, and not baptism.*’ Catechism, 1548. His later sentiments are yet more clear and determinate—‘When I use to speak sometimes (as the old authors do) that Christ is in the Sacraments. I mean the same as they do understand the matter—Sometimes by the word Sacrament, *I mean the whole Ministration and Receiving of the Sacraments*, either of Baptism or the Lord’s Supper. And so the old writers many times do say, that Christ and the Holy Ghost be present in the Sacraments; not meaning by that manner of speech, that Christ and the Holy Ghost be present in the water, bread, or wine, (*which be truly the outward visible Sacraments*) but that in the due Ministration of the Sacraments, according to Christ’s ordinance and institution, Christ and his Holy Spirit be truly and indeed present *by their mighty and sanctifying power, virtue, and grace, in all them that worthily receive the same.*’ Pref. of Answer to Gardiner. 1552.

¹ Homily, ut supra.

CHAP. III.

SACRAMENTAL ERRORS—ERRORS OF EXCESS.

It seems necessary, in order to a complete view of our subject, to advert, as briefly as possible, to some principal errors on the right hand and on the left. That there should be errors—diversified and important errors—connected with so much difference of judgment and corruption of heart, is no marvel. The ordinances themselves are holy. Yet man's perverseness makes them the occasion of sin and fearful provocation, even in the profession of a sound faith. Who needs not the warning—"Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall?"²

Archbishop Leighton admirably remarks upon the two extremes of Sacramental error—"First, of those that ascribe too much to Sacraments, as if they wrought by a natural inherent virtue, and carried grace in them inseparably. Secondly, of

² 1 Cor. x. 1—5. with 12.

those who ascribe too little to them—making them only signs and badges of our profession,³

Without confining ourselves to the Archbishop's detail, we will proceed to notice these two classes of error—*of excess, and of defect.*

I. In the former class—the first alluded to is—*assuming the Sacraments to contain innate grace.* This, *wherever it may be found*, constitutes the pure essence of Popery, the denial of which exposes us to all the thunders of the Tridentine curse.⁴ But in despite of this fulminating curse (to use the wise man's illustration, “a curse causeless which shall not come”⁵) we contend with Bishop Hopkins, that ‘to dream of any spiritual good, that accrues to the soul merely from *the opus operatum*—though faith signifies nothing—though faith seals nothing—is so far from the truth,’ that it can bring nothing but judgment.⁶ Let it be remembered, that God never meant to transfer to Sacraments his own power. Our Church strongly repudiates this deadly error. She declares of these ordinances,

³ On 1 Peter iii. 21.

⁴ Sess. vii. Can. 6, 8. Compare notes of Rhem. Testam. on 1 Pet. iii. 21. See Calvin's strong judgment, Instit. iv. 14. 14. Foxe's accurate statement, vi. 526. ⁵ Prov. xxvi. 2.

⁶ Works, ii. 434. A palpable instance of this *opus operatum* was the administration of the Lord's Supper to infants, or to the dying and insensible—a ‘primitive usage’ not discountenanced by the Tractators—Advert. vol. ii. pp. 5, 6. Tracts for the Times. Sewell's Christian Morals, pp. 387—392. Dr. Pusey pleads for a good sense of this term, Tracts on Baptism, p. 193.

that they work—not by inherent efficacy—but by Divine institution⁷—not of themselves—but by *virtue of prayer unto God*.⁸ She defines them with true Scriptural precision to be *means only—not sources—of grace*.⁹ The virtue is not therefore *in them*. But it flows *through them* from the Great Fountain Head. Nor let this be thought to be a mere verbal distinction. To make them—as some appear to do¹⁰—*sources of*

⁷ Art. xxvi. See Calvin on John xx. 22.

⁸ Art. xxvii.

⁹ Catechism.

¹⁰ So Dr. Pusey seems to consider them, though he often speaks of them as instruments. 'Baptism is spoken of as the source of our spiritual birth, as no other cause is—save God.' This he expounds—'We are not said to be regenerated by faith, or love, or prayer, or any grace which God worketh in us' (Who ever thought of mistaking the fruits of regeneration for the principle?) 'but to be born of (εκ John iii. 5.) "water and the Spirit," in contrast to our birth of the flesh (εκ v. 6); to be saved by the washing of regeneration or the new birth, in like manner as we are said to be born of God (εκ John i. 13.) or of incorruptible seed. (εκ 1 Peter i. 23.)' He admits 'other causes to be mentioned as connected with the new birth'—such as the word of God—the preaching of the Gospel. But he contends from the difference of the Greek construction (δια, 1 Cor. iv. 15. 1 Pet. i. 23.) that 'no other instrument is spoken of as having the same relation to our heavenly birth as this of water.' Tracts on Baptism, pp. 12, 13. Now this is—1. Very startling doctrine. 'Baptism is the source of our spiritual birth—as God'—We always thought, that God's place in the work was *solus* and *supremus*. Here, it seems, is a co-ordinate cause. How different from the precise and well-considered language of our article!—'Whereby—as by an instrument, they that receive Baptism rightly are grafted,' &c. (Art. xxvii.) 2. Loose statement. We are not said to be *born of water*, but—*of water and of the Spirit*. Water therefore has no absolute relation to a heavenly birth, as God has; inasmuch as the result follows—not *always*, when the water sprinkles, but *only*, when the Spirit accompanies the sprinkling. 3. In-

grace, is to put them in the place of Christ. To acknowledge them *as means*, is to depend upon Christ in them—to honour his appointment in their diligent improvement, and thus to ensure his gracious acceptance. We ascribe nothing to the instruments. All belongs to him, who condescends to work by and with them. Eminently clear and evangelical is the statement of Bishop Ridley—‘Every Sacrament hath grace annexed to it instrumentally. *It hath not grace included in it.* But to those *that receive it well*, it is turned to grace. After that manner water in Baptism hath grace promised, and by that grace the Holy Spirit is given; *not that grace is included in water, but that grace cometh by water.*¹¹ To the same purport writes Hooker, with his usual accuracy—‘Sacraments really exhibit, but, for aught we can gather out of that which is written of them, they are not really, *nor do they really contain in themselves, that grace, which with them, or by them, it pleaseth God to bestow.* The real presence of Christ’s most precious body

accurate criticism—absolutely fatal to his statement. We have only to compare Rom. vi. 4. Titus iii. 5. with 1 Cor. iv. 15. 1 Peter i. 23; Col. ii. 12. with Eph. v. 26; again Eph. v. 26. with James i. 18: and we see, that his Greek prepositions and cases conspire to dethrone baptism from its supremacy—proving that we are *not* saved *by* (διὰ) the washing of regeneration in like manner as we are said to be born of (ἐκ) God, and that the word is placed *on the same level, and in the same position* in the system, as another ‘instrument, having the same relation to our heavenly birth as this of water.’¹¹ Works, Parker Society’s Ed. pp. 240, 241.

and blood is not therefore to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament—in the heart and soul of him which receiveth.’¹²

II. We notice next, the error of *making the Sacraments in whole or in part the causal ground of our justification*. That some present danger is apprehended from this error, may be gathered from the fact, that the venerable watchmen of our Zion have lifted up their warning voice against it.¹³ That the Sacraments *seal* our justification we have fully shewn. But that they are in any way or degree *the cause* of it, we most strenuously deny. This was the fundamental error of the Judaizing teachers,¹⁴ diffusing its poison subsequently in the Galatian Church.¹⁵ Bishop Burnet justly characterizes it as ‘among the most mischievous of all those practical errors

¹² Book v. lxvii. 6. Compare lvii. 4. lx. 7. Book vi. 11. Waterland, *Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist*, ch. v. Works vii. As well in the Lord’s Supper, as in Baptism, the marvellous working of God, passing the comprehension of all man’s wits, is in the spiritual receivers—not in the bread, wine, and water, nor in the carnal and ungodly receivers.’—Cranmer’s *Remains*, iii. 525. ‘It is neither the work of the Priest, *nor the nature of the Sacrament as of itself*, that maketh us partakers of Christ’s death, but *only* the faith of the receiver.’ Bishop Jewell on the Sacraments, p. 284. See some valuable views in Bullinger’s *Sermons*, pp. 88—97.

¹³ Bishop of Chester’s Charge, 1841, p. 79. Bishop of Winchester’s Charge, 1841, p. 37. Bishop of Calcutta’s Charge, 1842-43, p. 47, 48—all of them fraught with important instruction “in the present truth.”

¹⁴ Acts xv. 1.

¹⁵ Gal. v. 2, 4.

that are in the Church of Rome.’¹⁶ But the leaven of Rome has spread far beyond her external precincts. How instructive is the exhibition of the unity of error—that “there is nothing new under the sun”—that the Bible is the book for every age of the Church! Is not the grand doctrine of man’s acceptance with God now, as in the Galatian Church, covered and clouded with a mass of ordinances? And do we not almost realize the great Apostle in the midst of us, warning us against “another Gospel”—not worthy of the name¹⁷—rebuking—remonstrating—expressing his deep and anxious suspicion respecting the soundness of the faith of his flock?¹⁸ The idea of placing ordinances *in the stead of Christ*, may indeed be vehemently disclaimed. But the depths of Satan—“the corruption of the angel of light”—would be *to link them with Christ*—thus marring the simplicity, integrity, and perfection of the One Foundation.¹⁹ Sacraments—thus displaced from their due position in the system, and unduly elevated—virtually become worse than valueless—offensive to God—“subverting men’s souls.”

¹⁶ On Art. xi.

¹⁷ Gal. i. 6, 7.

¹⁸ Ib. iii. 1—3. iv. 8—20.

¹⁹ Ib. v. 2—4. ut supra. Compare 2 Cor. xi. 3—14.

²⁰ Acts xv. 24. A valuable old writer infers with justice the value of the Sacraments, from the unceasing and subtle attempts which the enemy of the Church has ever made, to destroy their efficacy—either by corrupting the ceremonial—adulterating the doctrine—or perverting their ends. Zepperi de Sacramentis, pp. 20—22, 31, 39.

III. We advert to another error, mentioned by the Archbishop—assuming ‘*that the Sacraments carry grace in them inseparably.*’ And here the ground may be considered as virtually confined to infant baptism. The nullity of unworthy adult reciprocity is generally admitted by the standard writers.²¹ The palpable instance of Simon Magus is now banished from the argument, unless there be any, who insist, as Bp. Mant in former times, on his regeneration.²² The learned Bingham declares decidedly the judgment of the ancient church on this point.²³ The accordant judgment of our own Church cannot be mistaken—that she applies Sacramental benefit—not to all coming to the ordinance—but (to use her own most discriminating language) to ‘*persons truly repenting, and coming unto Christ by faith.*’²⁴

Taking up, then, the question upon the *infant* ground—the assumption that the inward grace is inseparable from the outward sign—*when thus broadly stated*—brings out this extraordinary doc-

²¹ ‘It must not be forgotten, that I am only contending for the invariable efficacy of baptism in adults, *when the mind of the recipient is duly prepared.*’ Archbishop Laurence’s Doctr. of Ch. of England, p. 23. Compare pp. 8, 9, 85, 95. Compare also Bishop Bethell on Regeneration, p. 16. Dr. Pusey appears to treat the subject—mainly at least—in reference to Infant Baptism, p. 171.

²² Tracts, pp. 42, 43.

²³ Antiquities, B. xi. c. 1.

²⁴ Exhortation in Service for Adult Baptism. Compare Art. xxv. xxvii. xxviii. xxix. Nowell’s Catechism—one of our most accredited Church documents. Compare Wits. De Effic. Baptism, § lxxx. Miscell. Sacra. Vol. ii.

trine—that the moment that any and every child is sprinkled with water—that moment each and every one passes from death to life, from the death *in sin* to the death *unto sin*—the spiritual grace of baptism. And this doctrine is laid down dogmatically, as admitting of no doubt—and as the incontrovertible faith, both of Scripture and of the Church. Now if it be the doctrine of Scripture, we must concede it, however revolting to our reason, We must silence reason, and exercise faith.²⁵ We must explain away the declarations of the Church, and put a new face upon the facts, that seem to us manifestly to contradict it. Yet we claim to call for demonstrable evidence, ere we can receive this startling dogma, as an article for our faith. And for ourselves—having long had before us all the producible evidence, and having weighed it deliberately, we hesitate not to declare our undoubting conviction. that the theory so confidently asserted is contradicted alike by the testimony *of Scripture—of the Church—and of fact.*

As to Scripture—The identity of circumcision with baptism is generally allowed.²⁶ The ends are the same—admission into covenant with God,

²⁵ Hooker, B. vi. vi. 11.

²⁶ Col. ii. 11, 12. Calvin has admirably drawn out his analogy, Instit. iv. 16. 3, 4. Compare 14, 21. Dr. Pusey insinuates—most unwarrantably—that the comparison is ordinarily instituted with the intent to bring down Baptism to the character of a lifeless and indifferent ordinance. Tracts on Baptism, pp. 131, 132.

and sealing with the blessings of this covenant.²⁷ The objects are the same—infants in both cases. The spiritual grace is identical—a renewed heart.²⁸ The analogy therefore—allowing for a more enlarged grace in the Gospel covenant—doubtless holds in their results. Yet in the mass of the circumcised nation, the outward sign was wholly unconnected with the inward grace.²⁹ How can we suppose that this whole mass of circumcision was uncircumcised—and yet that the whole mass of the baptized are regenerate—in heart? The Apostle's application of the subject manifestly supposes, that a baptized Christian, no less than a circumcised Jew—may be so—outwardly—yet not in heart.³⁰ Our Lord's discourse with Nicodemus shews the necessity of the sign with the thing signified for the completeness of the Sacrament. He first states the change generally—“*born again*”—then distributively—“of water and of the Spirit³¹”—the outward sign and the

²⁷ Gen. xvii. 9, 10. Mark x. 14. Matt. xxviii. 19.

²⁸ Deut. x. 12, 13, 16. xxx. 6. Phil. iii. 3. Col. ii. 11. Compare Catechism, and Collect for Circumcision. Homily on Prayer and Sacraments.

²⁹ Jer. vi. 10. ix. 25, 26. Acts vii. 51.

³⁰ Rom. ii. 28, 29.

³¹ John iii. 3, 5. See the same general—then distributive definition, 1 Pet. iii. 21. Compare also Mark xvi. 16. Titus iii. 5. Dr. Pusey quotes as a striking saying of St. Cyprian—‘As often as water is mentioned alone in Holy Scripture, so often is Baptism extolled.’ This system of interpretation he appears to regard as ‘reverence to the Sacrament of our Lord.’ Tracts on Baptism, p. 45. n. To us it appears so

inward grace—the one showing the federal—the other the spiritual—change. The birth of water is our admission into the visible—the birth of the Spirit is our entrance into the invisible—kingdom. But nothing is determined of their *absolute inseparability*—an hypothesis, which in fact is virtually surrendered by the admitted inefficacy of unworthy adult recipiency. The inward grace is symbolized by the outward sign, but not inseparable from it.

The Church—as we have seen—restricts Sacramental blessing *to the worthy recipient*. And are there no instances of unworthy—and therefore ineffectual—reception? no instances of total ignorance, ungodliness, formality, unbelief? Can that be worthy recipiency, when the ordinance has been desecrated by mockery or superstition, wholly unconnected with one particle of spiritual qualification, or one prayer (for the repetition of a form deserves not the name of prayer) for Divine grace? ³² The Baptismal service, *rightly un-*

unwarranted from Scripture, that we regard it only as superstition, in no degree honourable to the holy ordinance.

³² An infant—as a child of wrath—*considered in himself*—is a gracious subject—not a worthy recipient—of baptism. He can only be so considered, when presented to the ordinance in faith, and when repentance and faith—the true qualifications for baptism—are *sincerely professed on his behalf*, thus identifying the case as far as possible with the adult candidate. The innocence which is generally alleged as his qualification (Abp. Laurence, pp. 115, 116, 130, 170. Bishop Bethell, p. 14. Dr. Pusey's Tracts, pp. 83—85.) is an unscriptural fiction, which goes far (as Mr. Faber remarks) to deny

derstood,³³ and compared with the other standards of the Church, accords with this restricted view. Indeed we doubt not that Hooker accurately gives the judgment of the Church—'All receive not the grace of God, which receive the Sacraments of his grace. The use thereof is in our hand; the effect is in his. For the use we have his express command: for the effect his conditional promise.'³⁴ 'Many'—says the heavenly Leighton—'stay on the outward element, and go no further; Christians, and yet no Christians; baptized, yet unbaptized.'³⁵

And does not *fact* bear ample and melancholy confirmation of this statement? What say we to the mass of our baptized population, whom we know to be, and always to have been, as ungodly, as the few unbaptized that may be mingled with them? Can we pronounce them, as they live before our eyes, to be the regenerated, adopted children of God—the subjects of a vital and hea-

original sin. Our Church uses the term—not (as Archbishop Laurence insists, pp. 115, 116.) 'as clearly explaining the universal qualification,' but in the Scriptural allusion to childlike simplicity (See Mark x. 14, 15 :) while on the other hand, she strongly sets out his birth-sin as the ground of his Baptism, and pleads for him as a guilty sinner—that he may receive *remission of his sins*, and release *from them*. A corrupt nature—so far from presenting no obstacle (*non ponentibus obicem*, Sess. Trid. vii. 6.)—must—as the root and principle of active sin—present, even before its active development, a positive hindrance to the operation of Divine grace. See Mr. Faber's powerful reasoning, Prim. Doctr. Reg. pp. 248—252.

³³ See *Infra*. Chap. v.

³⁴ B. v. lvii. 4, 5.

³⁵ On 1 Pet. iii. 21.

venly change—such as involves the “putting off the old man—the renewal in the spirit of the mind—and the putting on of the new man—the new creation in the holy image of God?”³⁶ Our enquiry for the evidence of this universal change is indeed rebuked, as savouring of unbelief.³⁷ But we are bound to test this supposed fact, like every other fact, by the evidence of our outward senses, and to believe that as the soul is the principle of our actions, so they will show the nature of the soul. Our reverence for the Book of God does not teach us to disregard other lessons of instruction placed before us. Now here, fact and experience mutually illustrate each other, and palpably prove that those who are living in habitual sin,³⁸ in unbelief,³⁹ in love of the world,⁴⁰ in disobedience to the Gospel, and want of love to the brethren,⁴¹ never were regenerated. Their breaking of the law made their Baptism virtually no Baptism,⁴² and furnishes indisputable proof that the external ceremony is to a large extent separable from the spiritual grace.

³⁶ Eph. iv. 22—24.

³⁷ Pusey's Tracts, pp. 164—166. Sewell's Christian Morals, p. 239.

³⁸ 1 John ii. 29. iii. 9, 10. v. 18.

³⁹ Ib. v. 1. John i. 12, 13.

⁴⁰ Ib. verse 4. It is a striking and true remark of Bishop Wilson's (Sodor and Man.) ‘The only certain proof of regeneration is victory.’ (Maxims of Piety.) For no exercise of godliness can be effected without a conflict and victory over the corrupt principle.

⁴¹ 1b. iv. 7. 1 Pet. 22, 23.

⁴² Comp. Rom. ii. 25.

How then can this overstrained theory be made to bend to the undeniable testimony *of fact*? The soul of the baptized infant is at the moment and by the ordinance of baptism, "made an holy temple unto the Lord." Yet its first manifestations, coeval with the early buddings of reason, are not—"holiness to the Lord"—but all the evil tempers of a corrupt nature. We hear of the baptismal union with Christ; but we look in vain for the "new creation"—its inseparable consequent.⁴³ To pronounce it to be "born of the Spirit," while all its product has been the works of the flesh; to declare its regeneration upon the authority, not of the word of God, but of the Baptismal register—appealing to the test of the outward sacrament—not of godly fruits—thus to believe against the evidence of our senses; this is not faith, but gross credulity, superstition, and enthusiasm. Nay more—it is a refined, but not less true or less deadly form of gross antinomianism—hitherto considered the delusion of ignorant and loose-living men, but now put forward by men of theological erudition and external godliness.

Various explanations are given of this strange phenomenon. We are told *that regeneration is a change of state, not of nature*, and therefore the soul may be regenerate, yet unconverted and un-

⁴³ Rom. vi. 4. with 2 Cor. v. 17.

godly. Yet the regeneration spoken of by our Lord, as expounded by the Apostle's detail of its fruits ⁴⁴, manifests a spiritual, not a relative change. The regeneration which our Church connects with Baptism is of the same spiritual character—'a death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness' ⁴⁵—a Divine principle of a new, spiritual, and heavenly life.

Or the grace lies dormant for future development. But this is a gratuitous and unscriptural assumption. For—apart from the case of infants dying in infancy, and making full allowance for the retarding influence of early development—yet the Scriptural view of the kingdom of God is that of an active, operating principle—the mustard-seed, gradually expanding from its small beginnings, to a wide-spreading and useful tree—"the leaven, hid" indeed, but working, "till the whole be leavened." ⁴⁶ We cannot conceive of God's wonder-working energy without some manifest result—that the subject of this energy would be characterized by the same features as before this working. ⁴⁷ "In this the children of God *are manifested*, and the children of the devil." ⁴⁸ Where therefore no perceptible difference can be marked, even by the wisest "discerner of spirits," between the baptized and the unbaptized—nothing

⁴⁴ John iii. 3, 5. with 1 John ii. 29. iii. 4.

⁴⁵ Catechism.

⁴⁶ Matt. xiii. 31—33.

⁴⁷ Ib. vii. 16—18, xii. 33.

⁴⁸ 1 John iii. 7, 8, 10.

in which the millions of the former are manifestly better than the latter; we are bound to believe that no regenerating change has been wrought.⁴⁰

But we are told that the Baptismal grace has been destroyed by opposition. Now that the great new-creating work—the work of Omnipotence—should have been brought into existence and swept away, without *one* mark of it having ever been visible—that God should have annihilated his own work, or permitted its annihilation, ere the unconscious subject had “discerned between its right hand and its left hand,” and ere it had forfeited this inestimable blessing by *a single act* of

⁴⁰ ‘They are regenerated, and as it were, brought forth anew by the Holy Ghost, so that they shall be nothing like the men they were before.’—Homily for Whitsunday, Part i. Bishop Taylor pronounces this judgment on the baptized, living in ungodliness—‘They were washed in water, but were never baptized with the Spirit. They would think the preacher rude, if he should say they are not Christians, they are not within the Covenant of the Gospel; but it is certain, that the spirit of manifestation is not yet on them, and that is the first effect of the Spirit, whereby we can be called sons of God or relatives of Christ. If the Holy Ghost be not come upon you to great purposes of holiness, all other pretences are vain; ye are still in the flesh, which shall never inherit the kingdom of God.’ Sermons, Edn. 1807, Vol. ii. pp. 4, 7. See some very remarkable admissions of this difficulty of unfruitful regeneration, in Mr. Newman’s last Volume of Sermons, pp. 77–79. Beza, after speaking of infants dying in infancy, and saved, asks—‘Concerning the rest, what else could we determine, except with the manifest rashness, that they are then at length regenerated, when faith is given to them by hearing?’ Ad act. Collat. Mompel. p. 106, apud Wits. § xxx. Augustine’s view of the spiritual blessing of baptism is of a suspended and contingent, and therefore uncertain, efficacy—‘Si Christianam tenuerint pietatem, sequitur etiam in corde conversio, cujus mysterium præcessit in corpore.’ Contr. Don. iv.

personal transgression—that he should have stamped his own image only to be thus instantly effaced—that the Great Inhabitant of this temple should have departed without one visible token of his presence—that the heavenly flame should have been quenched without having emitted *one* vital spark—this is an hypothesis which evinces low, degrading apprehensions of Divine agency, and is alike revolting to reason and faith.

We would not shrink from avowing our individual judgment in accordance with Hooker ‘on the Perpetuity of the Faith of God’s Elect.’ But when the existence of the principle is in our apprehension more than doubtful, its defectibility or indefectibility seems scarcely to belong to the argument ; and we prefer to argue the question upon common rather than upon controverted ground.

We would add moreover, that this theory does not give the fair view of sound writers, who, with Mr. Faber, demur to Hooker’s doctrine. It would be generally admitted by these respectable writers that the mass persevere, and a few (comparatively) apostatize—and those—like Demas, after having held on in the Christian profession. Here it is the mass that apostatize, and *that* without having made one open step in the Christian course. The few—few indeed—persevere ; an hypothesis, which again reduces the effect of Divine operation to a feeble, contracted, unproductive influence.⁵⁰

⁵⁰ 1 Tim. i. 19. 2 Tim. ii. 18, iv. 10. 1 John ii. 19.

Our convictions therefore as Ministers of the Gospel constrain us to preach to our *baptized professors* the same doctrine of regeneration, which our Lord preached to *the circumcised Jews*—"Ye must be born again."¹ Admitting however the separation of the outward and the inward part of the Sacrament—the practical encouragement still remains. Our God is ever willing to grant the grace, where it is duly sought. Though he has not tied his blessing to ordinances, he has bound himself to the prayer of faith, when claiming that grace which the sign symbolizes.

IV. We would, lastly, enter our protest against the error of *exalting the Sacraments as the exclusive, or even the primary, means of grace. The*

¹ John iii. 7. 'I would solemnly protest'—said a late eminent prelate—'against that most serious error of contemplating all the individuals of a *baptized* congregation, as *having* once known the truth, and entered upon the right path—as not therefore requiring that "transformation by the renewing of the mind"—that "putting off of the old man, and putting on the new man," which is so emphatically enjoined by St. Paul to his *baptized* Romans and Ephesians. This erroneous view in my mind strikes at the root of all useful and effectual preaching. Ministerial addresses founded upon it soothe and delude the people into a false peace. They may make many a pharisee, and produce on many a death-bed a vain self-righteous ease, which must soon be changed into self-condemnation and death eternal. But they will never be the spiritual "weapons, mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds, and bringing the servants of Satan into captivity to the obedience of Jesus Christ,"' &c. &c. Bishop Ryder's Primary Charge at Gloucester. See Dean Milner's valuable remarks on this subject. Life, pp. 638—654. Compare the solemn warnings to the *circumcised Jews*. Deut. x. 16. Jer. iv. 4, ix. 25, 26.

exclusive doctrine in its full measure and proportion seems to be of modern date; and its advocates have departed from their characteristic deference to the standard of the Fathers, whose preaching diligence gave their practical testimony to at least *one other* important ordinance.² Yet so momentous is this new dogma in their judgment, that one of the leading objects of their great movement confessedly was to bring it more fully before the Church.³ We are revolted *in limine* by the

² See the multiplied and most interesting evidence given by Bingham. Book xiv. c. 4.

³ See Mr. Perceval's Letter to the Irish Ecclesiastical Journal. The deep infusion of this doctrine into their principal writings shews their sense of its efficacy. (Keble's Pref. to Hooker. p. lxxxiv. Tracts for the Times, Advert. Vol. i. 3, 4.—Do. ii. 5, 6.—Tract. 90, p. 46.—Dr. Pusey's Defence of same.—Do. Tracts on Baptism—Do. Earnest Remonstrance to the Author of the Pope's Letter, p. 38. Sewell's Christian Morals, pp. 145, 392.) This doctrine is identified with the Canon of Trent. Sess. vii. c. 4. How little unity of soul have they with the saintly George Herbert, who was wont to call 'the pulpit his throne!' (Country Parson, chap. vii. Compare Hooker, B. v. 18, 22.) Would they sympathize with the prophetic burst of rapture at the distant sight "upon the mountains of *the beautiful feet* of the messengers of peace?" (Isa. lii. 7.) Would they respond to—nay—would they not rather have inverted—the Apostle's thanksgiving for a limited Sacramental, and an enlarged Preaching, commission? (1 Cor. i. 15—17.) Do they never feel it to be a link in the chain of church-bondage—to be restricted from an exclusive Sacramental Ministry, and to be constrained to a service 'only suited to a weak and languishing state, and which the Scripture—to say the least—has never much recommended, as a mode of doing good?' (Tract 87.) We are sometimes reminded of Hooker's doubtful question—'Whether error may do more by the curious subtlety of sharp discourse, or else by the mere appearance of zeal and devout affection?' B. v. lxii. 8.

'merciless strictness'⁴ of this hypothesis, so contrary to the fact of Scripture,—no less than to the free and gracious spirit of the Gospel. It shuts out the dying thief from heaven (as Bishop Hale writes)—'never washed in Jordan, yet received in Paradise; scoured only with the blood of the Saviour, not with the water of Baptism—yet presented glorious to God.'⁵ With him it excludes, not only the whole mass of the baptized, but all the unworthy recipients of Baptism, as having made null and void *that regeneration*, which can never be repeated, and which, *in their system*, is the indispensable qualification—the one way of entrance into the kingdom of heaven. Thus does this case become tantamount to the unpardonable sin. The day of grace was irrevocably sinned away at the baptismal font.⁶

⁴ Hooker, B. v. lx. 7.

⁵ Luke xxiii. 40—43. Bishop Hall's Epist. Dec. v. 4. See Mr. Faber's clear and powerful argument, Prim. Doctr. of Regener. pp. 118—120. also Augustine's beautiful statements, though disfigured with that fiction of theology—'the Baptism of martyrs in their blood.'—Ibid. pp. 202, 203. We might also ask, Shall men limit God, that there should be no infants like John the Baptist—"filled with the Holy Ghost *from their mother's womb, and therefore before their baptism?*" Luke i. 15.

⁶ Bishop Mant's statement compared with our Lord's, excludes all the unbaptized from heaven. Our Lord asserts the *absolute necessity of regeneration*. John iii. 3, 5, 7. The Bishop asserts, 'that no other than baptismal regeneration is possible in the world.'—Tracts, p. 32. Bishop Bethell states to the same purport—'Regeneration comes only once in and through Baptism.' p. 14. Ergo—no unregenerate—i. e. *no unbaptized-person* can see the kingdom of God. Compare Acts

We need scarcely remark, that such is not the spirit of our Church. Let her deeply spiritual services bear testimony to her high estimation of the Sacraments. Yet they do not occupy the exclusive position in her œconomy. She declares them to be *a means*—one among others; not, as some of her professed children would have it—*the means*⁷—an apparently trivial, but a most significant distinction. She preserves the true Scriptural moderation—pronouncing them to be ‘*generally, not absolutely, necessary unto salvation.*’⁸

xv. 1. We doubt not but the unbaptized suffer loss—great loss—from the neglect of obedience to the command, and improvement of the privilege. But we dare not—we would not—exclude them from heaven. Bishop Bethell faints under the difficulty to his theory from the case of the unworthy recipient. He has no doubt of his salvation *as a subsequent penitent*, but he confesses himself unable to give the ground of his charitable judgment, and finally adds—‘It is a case not mentioned in the covenant, nor supposed and provided for in the word of God.’ Apology, p. 5. There seems to have been some difference of judgment in the ancient church upon this point—Augustine taking the milder, Cyril of Jerusalem the stricter, side. (Pusey’s Tracts, pp. 174—176.) How much more Scriptural is Bishop Burnet’s statement of the case—‘If one has been *wanting* in the inward acts, these may be afterwards renewed, and *that want* may be made up by repentance.’ On Art. xxvii. Some reference however is here needed to the blood of atonement to give completeness and full Scripture clearness to the statement.

⁷ Catechism compared with Tracts for the Times, ut supra.

⁸ Catechism ut supra. Yet—strange to say—Dr. Pusey has actually confounded this most precise distinction, and thus turned it to the support of his own exclusive doctrine. Referring to Mr. Newman’s statement (ut supra, Tract 90, p. 46.) he adds—‘With this coincides the definition of our Catechism—that there are two Sacraments only, *generally (i.e. universally)* necessary to salvation.’ (Defence of Tract 90, p. 34) But

But “to the law, and to the testimony,” as the final appeal—“What saith the Scripture?” Let us look at *the personal and the didactic* Ministry of our Lord and his Apostles. Our Lord’s baptizing Ministry—as he was not used to exhibit empty signs—must have been attended with a measure, though not with a full measure,⁹ of Divine influence. Yet *in the midst of this administration* he regenerated Nicodemus¹⁰ and the woman of Samaria¹¹ by other means than by bap-

compare ‘Rubric subjoined to Communion of the sick:—also Hooker, B. v. lx. 2, 5—7. Bullinger’s Sermons, pp. 166, 170—172. Beza traces this over-rigorous strictness to the zeal of the African Confessors in the Pelagian Controversy—insisting upon the Sacraments—perhaps too strongly—in opposition to the heretical doctrine. Epist. Theolo. Lib. i. 8. Augustine’s own views are given by Dr. Pusey on Baptism, p. 272.—Compare Bp. Hooper’s Early Writings, p. 132. Upon this extreme hypothesis David could not have built his consoling confidence in the death of his *uncircumcised* child. 2 Sam. xii. 18, 22, 23. We express our entire concurrence with the following sentiments of one, who has never been suspected of undervaluing the necessity of the Sacraments—‘A person living in a heathen land is deprived of these ordinances, by which he might attach himself to the *body of the Church*, and yet by faith he may be united to *her soul*. The same may be said of those, who, through unavoidable ignorance, know not what the Church is, and therefore neglect one part of their duty; but are—though *not sacramentally—still by faith, vitally united to him*.’ Dr. Hook’s Sermon—‘The Gospel the only basis of education.’ We cannot but feel—notwithstanding Dr. Pusey’s explanation (Tracts p. 20) that by the omission of baptism in the latter clause of Mark xvi. 16, our Lord intended to intimate the substance to be *absolutely*—the sign to be *generally*—necessary to salvation. If he binds us to certain means or external professions, he does not bind himself.

⁹ Matt. iii. 11. Acts i. 5.

¹⁰ John iii. 1—22.

¹¹ Ibid. iv. 1, 2, 29.

tism. Nor is there any evidence that he subsequently brought them or his other converts (e. g. Zaccheus ¹²) under this holy ordinance. Thus he recognized it as *a mean—not the means*. In the Apostolic converts, faith—*the principle and evidence of regeneration* ¹³—was a pre-requisite to baptism. ¹⁴ The Great Apostle himself was evidently renewed previous to his baptism, ¹⁵ and was himself the instrument of *conveying regeneration* to many, whom he did *not baptize*. ¹⁶ Baptism therefore in the Apostolic Ministry was not *the means*.

Next, let us look at *the didactic Ministry* of the New Testament. By thus marking the precise position, which the Sacraments occupy in the Christian system, we shall be able to test the Tractarian instruction by the analogy, and at once discern its harmony or discrepancy. We observe then, that our Lord in his later, more enlarged and confidential communications, gave no distinct

¹² Luke xix. 5, 9.

¹³ John i. 12, 13 1 John v. 1.

¹⁴ Acts ii. 41; viii. 37.

¹⁵ Bishop Mant hesitates not to speak of him as 'converted and renewed in heart, and obedient.' Dr. Pusey differs from him *toto cælo*. Compare Bp. Mant's Tracts, p. 43 with Dr. Pusey on Baptism, pp. 46, 47. Let the reader ponder the history (Acts ix. 6—18.) and consider whether—apart from other evidence—the prayer, to which his Saviour bore testimony in his chosen apostle (11.) was not a spiritual act; and if so, whether the praying man was not a spiritual—i. e.—a renewed man. Surely as natural acts suppose a natural, so must spiritual acts proceed from a spiritual, birth. See Witsius' beautiful exposition. De Effic. Baptismi § lxviii.

¹⁶ 1 Cor. i. 14—16 with iv. 15.

prominence to these holy ordinances. We have the simple history of their institution, and their important ends.¹⁷ But there is no all-pervading Sacramental influence throughout his instruction. He connects the privileges about to be conferred upon his Church, *not with the ordination of the Sacraments*, but with the plenary effusion of the Spirit.¹⁸ Christian holiness flows from a vital union with himself, maintained, *not by Sacraments* (to which not the most remote allusion is made) but by a daily, living faith.¹⁹ In his subsequent Ministry to the Apocalyptic Churches no mention is made of the Sacraments, as among the means for the revival of their decayed life.²⁰

The Apostolic Ministry is of the same character. A few strong Sacramental references are made with deep and powerful application.²¹ But on the other hand, whole epistles were written to Christian churches and individuals,²² expounding fully the grand fundamentals of the Gospel, without the most distant allusion to these holy ordinances. Nay, one of the Sacraments is clearly subordinated to *another* means of grace, comparatively little valued by the teachers of this school.²³ It seems

¹⁷ Matt. xxvi. 26—28. Luke xxii. 19. Matt. xxviii. 19.

¹⁸ John xiv. 12, 20, xvi. 12, 13 with Luke xxiv. 49.

¹⁹ Ibid. xv. 1—5.

²⁰ Rev. ii. iii.

²¹ Rom. vi. 4, 5. 1 Cor. v. 7, 8, x. 16, 17, xii. 13. Col. ii. 11—13, &c.

²² E. g. Epistles to the Philippians, Thessalonians; of James and Jude; to Philemon, Second and Third Epistles of John.

²³ 1 Cor. i. 17. This is not to be taken literally, since the

a little remarkable, that the Ministerial Epistles should contain no injunctions to the two presbyters concerning their administration.

Now in comparing the Ministry of our Lord and his Apostles with the Tractarian system, such is the discrepancy between them as to the prominence given to Sacramental ordinances, that we are compelled to reflect either upon the one as defective in important points, or upon the other as overstrained and exaggerated. It will be easy to determine the side, to which the rebuke should be directed.²⁴

This comparison is not instituted to deteriorate these sacred ordinances in our estimation. Their Divine appointment stamps upon them an indelible value; and what Christian does not give his testimony to the blessing of their faithful improvement? But let our system in this as in

Baptismal was combined with the Preaching commission. Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. Yet it obviously marks a strong subordination in the comparison of the one with the other. Had the Apostle entertained the notion of universal Baptismal Regeneration, his yearning love for the salvation of souls, would have led him—instead of rejoicing in his limited administration (15, 16)—like the Romish missionary, to constrain the multitude to receive at his hands the saving ordinance. Yet Peter seemed to take the same view of his commission, as his beloved brother. He *preached* the Gospel to Cornelius and his company. But “he *commanded them to be baptized*” by other hands. Acts x. 34—48.

²⁴ This single point is illustrative of the general judgment of the Bishop of Calcutta, supported by various matters of detail—‘What the New Testament is full of, the authors before us pass over slightly—what the New Testament passes over slightly, they are full of.’ Charge, pp. 40—42.

other points, both *in matter and proportion*, be carefully fitted to the Scriptural model; and, while we highly honour the Sacraments, let us guard against unduly elevating them beyond the position, which they occupy in the sacred œconomy.

For ourselves—we give our full assent to Bishop Hopkins' judgment—that—*not the Sacraments*—but 'the preaching of the Word is the great means, which God hath appointed for regeneration.'²⁵ The commission of the gospel is the grand lever of this Almighty agency.²⁶ By this

²⁵ Works ii. 493. Bishop Ridley's Works, p. 222. Latimer's Sermons. See 6th. Sermon on Rom. xv. 4. and on Matt. xxii. 2. 'Though the Word cannot beget without him; yet it is by the word that he begets, and ordinarily not without it.' Leighton on 1 Pet. i. 23. 'The Word of God is the ordinary means of our new-birth.' Whitby *ibid.* and on James i. 18. Bishop Hall on James i. 18. Thus Hooker speaks of the Word as 'the *necessary means* to eternal life—*itself* the instrument, which God *hath properly framed*, thereby to work the knowledge of salvation in the hearts of men. The Word of God outwardly administered (his Spirit inwardly concurring therewith) converteth, edifieth, and saveth souls.' B. v. c. xxi. What rich and refreshing unction is there in the following statement!—'The cause of life spiritual in us is Christ—not carnally or corporally inhabiting—but dwelling in the soul of man, as a thing which, when the mind apprehendeth it, is said to inhabit and possess the mind. *The mind conceiveth Christ by hearing the doctrine of Christianity.* Wherefore when we read, that the Spirit is our life; or, the Word our life; or, Christ our life, we are in every one of these to understand, that our *life is Christ*, by the *hearing of the Gospel* apprehended as a Saviour, and assented unto by the power of the Holy Ghost.' Discourse on Justification. Works, iii. 642.

²⁶ Acts ii. 37. iv. 4. xxvi. 16—18. with Rom. i. 16, x. 13—15. with 1 Cor. i. 17—24. iv. 15. James i. 18—21—Could Dr. Pusey have remembered James i. 18—when he ventured his assertion, that 'Regeneration is no where in Scripture dis-

instrumentality the Christian Churches were first brought into the faith,²⁷ and *mainly* established in it.²⁸ Through the same medium in individual cases is imparted not only that “incorruptible seed,” but the daily sustenance and growth of what Scougal so truly calls ‘the life of God in the soul of man.’²⁹ Faith is instrumentally the quickening principle.³⁰ But “faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.”³¹ This is sufficient to establish this great ordinance, as the weightiest exercise of Ministerial responsi-

connected from Baptism,’ (Tracts, p. 14) when not only there is no allusion to that ordinance in the context, but none direct or indirect throughout the whole Epistle? We venture to assert, that this connexion is rare, compared with the large majority of cases, where it is totally dissevered from it.

²⁷ Acts xiii. 48. xiv. 3. xvii. 1—4. 1 Thess. i. 5, ii. 13. Compare John viii. 32; xvii. 17. ‘It is worthy of notice, that in the *Parisian Breviary*’—in its long services for the feast of dedication, composed of passages from Scripture, hymns, and homilies, there appears no allusion to the end or the object of building Churches—viz—*the converting of persons by preaching*. It abounds with allusions to building up the spiritual temple, and to the awful presence of God in the Sacrament. Whatever objection may be made to this testimony, it *serves at all events to prove what the religion of a former age was*’—Tract 80. p. 69. Thus would this writer direct us, where he has plainly gone himself, to a Popish Breviary as the standard of our faith. He gives indeed a sound ‘proof of what the religion of a former age was,’ and expounds the reason well. When the word of God was dethroned from its high supremacy, and a religion of Sacraments substituted in its place, there is a clear, but painful, explanation of the darkness of the Romish ages, from the return of which, the Lord preserve his Church!

²⁸ Ib. xiv. 21, 22, xv. 36—41. 1 Thess. iii. 2—10.

²⁹ 1 Pet. i. 23. ii. 2. ³⁰ John i. 12, 13.

³¹ Rom. x. 17—Eph. i. 13.

bility, as well as the most fruitful in its results to the Church—and by the Church to the world.

To those—specially among our younger brethren—who, perhaps with some doubtfulness—still cling to the exclusive system, we would venture to suggest—whether with a sincere intention reverentially to honour the ordinances of God, there may not be some need of Calvin's wholesome warning of 'the danger of making an idol of the Sacrament through perverse superstition.'³² Archbishop Ussher's words are words of wisdom—'When God affordeth means, we must wait upon him for a blessing in them and by them. When he doth not afford means, we must not tie the working of his grace to them. Some have the outward sign, and not the inward grace. Some have the inward grace, and not the outward sign. We must not commit idolatry by deifying the outward elements. It is not the want of the Sacraments, but the contempt or wilful neglect of them, that is dangerous.'³³

³² On Eph. v. 26—Dr. Pusey regards this caution with pain—as a cold fear of giving too much to the Sacrament. Tracts, p. 41, n. But is there not a wholesome fear of formality, quite consistent with giving due honour to the ordinance?

³³ Body of Divinity, pp. 506, 507. 'Non privatio, sed contemptus Sacramentorum damnat.' Bernard Ep. 77. August. de Bapt. contra Donat. iv. 23, 24, 25, quoted by Mr. Faber p. 67. Bishop Jewel's Defence of Apology. p. 218. Witsii de Bapt. § lxxix. Abp. Bramhall's Works, p. 981.

CHAP. IV.

SACRAMENTAL ERRORS—ERRORS OF DEFECT.

WE now advert to the opposite class of Sacramental errors—*errors of defect*. As there is less controversy on this side of the question, we need not enter into so extended a discussion. Yet if we speak more briefly, we would not speak less decidedly. We have a strong conviction, that all the evil is not on one side, but that a defective apprehension or exhibition of the Sacraments greatly deteriorates the tone and efficiency of our Ministrations. We notice here in detail,—

I. *A want of deep reverence for these Divine Ordinances*. Bishop Hoadley's Sacramental views were in consistency with the heretical school, to which he unhappily belonged. We should however deeply regret to observe any tendencies to his Rationalistic theory connected with a sounder creed. Those symbols, which are employed to represent and to convey such inestimable blessings, are far beyond naked signs. They claim our re-

verence, while they exercise our faith. Let us be careful, lest our dread of superstition should hurry us over the proper mean into a want of due solemnity and regard. It is a profound remark of Hooker—full of weight—that ‘vices have not only virtues, but other vices also in nature opposite to them. In sores and sicknesses of the mind we are not simply to measure good by distance from evil, because one vice may in some respect be more opposite to another, than either of them to that virtue, which holdeth the mean between them both.’³⁴ The ‘vicious extremity’ opposed to formality is much to be dreaded. And a well-balanced mind will incessantly watch against any tone of it or approach to it. Yet opposition to error may be baneful error. Superstition is indeed a serious evil, but not to be corrected by irreverence. True it is—most sadly true—that Baptism has too often worn the garb of a Romish ceremony, rather than of a Divine Ordinance. But let us not forget the great things that belong to it—how its Great Author, at the moment of its institution, as an universal ordinance of the Church, declared himself invested with “all power in heaven and in earth”³⁵—how it had been previously honoured, as no other ordinance ever before, with a visible manifestation of the Sacred Trinity³⁶—how the high privileges of the Gospel are clustered

³⁴ B. v. lxv. 20.

³⁵ Matt. xxviii. 19.

³⁶ Ib. iii. 16, 17.

around it. Surely then we mistake not in considering with Bishop Latimer 'the Sacrament of Baptism to be a thing of great weight'³⁷—or with Archbishop Ussher—'an high Ordinance of God, and a means whereby he hath appointed to communicate Christ and his benefits to our souls; and therefore not to be neglected or slightly esteemed, but *used with all reverence* and thankful devotion where it may be had.'³⁸ Not less honour is due to the sacred supper. 'The great dignity of this holy mystery' may be justly inferred, as well from the grounds of its high privilege,³⁹ as 'from the great peril of the unworthy receiving thereof.'⁴⁰

Is there no danger in some quarters, lest, when the absolute necessity of Sacraments is denied, they should be viewed almost as matters indifferent—the former especially, as a mere ritual observance? What if we should profess to be satisfied with the word of God without his seal? Would not this be to despise a rich gift of grace—to impugn alike the wisdom and goodness of our God? It might seem to be pure and implicit faith. But it is a shadowy covering for proud presumption. For would God ordain without a suitable and sufficient reason? When Abraham's

³⁷ Sermon preached on St. John Evangelist Day, 1552.

³⁸ Body of Divinity, p. 505.

³⁹ 1 Cor. x. 16. Warning for the celebration of the Sacrament.

⁴⁰ Exhortation in Sacramental Service—1 Cor. xi. 27—29.

“faith had been counted for righteousness, it was deemed necessary that he should receive the seal of righteousness.”⁴¹ Where there is true faith, there will be genuine simplicity and humility : and in this spirit the Sacraments will be duly revered. The eunuch, though conscious of the sincerity of his faith, did not on that account despise the seal : “ See—here is water ; what doth hinder me to be baptized ? ”⁴² Nor did Cornelius, though gifted with the heavenly blessing, deem the external witness superfluous.⁴³ We can readily—in extreme cases—admit of sanctification without the use of the Sacraments. But when we consider their Divine authority and heavenly blessings, we fully accord with Dr. Pusey’s judgment, that ‘ a low, inadequate, or unworthy conception must of necessity almost be very injurious to the whole of our belief and practice. Does not ’ (he adds in words well deserving consideration) ‘ our very reverence to our Saviour require, that we should think any thing, which he deigned to institute, of very primary moment—not (as some seem now to think) simply to be obeyed and complied with ; but to be embraced with a glad and thankful recognition of its importance, because he instituted it ? ’⁴⁴

II. We notice next—*a want of faith*. This error

⁴¹ Rom. iv. 3, 11.

⁴² Acts viii. 35, 36. Compare Hooker, v. lx. 4.

⁴³ Ib. x. 44—48.

⁴⁴ Tracts on Baptism, p. 6.

of defect is intimately connected with the last. To a mind unexercised in Sacramental solemnities, the external ordinance is the prominent object, with little excitement of expected results. But if the testimony of Scripture and the definition of our Church be fully acknowledged, there is a clear warrant for enlarged faith. The ordinances were intended, not only to exhibit the blessings of the Gospel, but to excite our desires after them. May we not therefore expect, that in the exercise of faith they will be made the channels of conveyance? Is there not full encouragement to put forth our hands, and freely to receive the favour which God so freely tenders to us? The signs will be felt under the Lord's blessing to be animated with life, and honoured as a means, 'by which our gracious God doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in him.'⁴⁵ Unbelief is no less dishonourable to God, and paralyzing to his work, than formal superstition.⁴⁶ To undermine or to neglect the rule and ground of faith,⁴⁷ is to destroy the efficacy of the Sacrament. To substitute seriousness for faith, is to work with a feeble and ineffective instrument. If the Sacraments are means of grace, ought we not to be looking for the grace through the means? And may not their barrenness be too often explained—"Ye have not, because ye ask not?"⁴⁸ To call

⁴⁵ Art. xxv.⁴⁷ See Matt. ix. 29.⁴⁶ Matt. xiii. 58. xvii. 19, 20. Mark vi. 5.⁴⁸ James iv. 2.

to mind the rich and free promises here sealed to us—to lay hold of them with a firmer grasp of faith—to consider these seals as the earnest of a sure and heavenly blessing—this would establish a confidence fraught with life and energy, hope and joy to our Christian profession. ‘Where they are not either through contempt unreceived, or received with contempt,’ (including every kind of wilful abuse,) ‘we are not to doubt, but that they really give what they promise, and are what they signify. For we take not baptism nor the eucharist for bare resemblance or memorials of things absent, neither for naked signs and testimonies, assuring us of grace received before: but (as they are indeed and in verity) for means effectual, whereby God, when we take the Sacrament, delivereth into our hands that grace available unto eternal life, which grace the Sacraments represent or signify.’⁴⁹

III. *We mention—lastly—under this class of errors—a want of practical improvement of the Sacraments.* Disputation is a most unhealthy atmosphere for the Christian life. It is only in the practical exercise of religion, that we can form any just estimate of its inestimable value.

How valuable and diversified are the uses of Baptism! *As living members of a living Head—*“baptized into his death”—how powerful is the

⁴⁹ Hooker v. lvii. 5.

constraint to holiness !⁵⁰ ‘A Christian growing torpid in indolence’—as Bishop Davenant reminds us—‘that is—not bearing the fruit of righteousness, nor aiming at newness of life, although he abstains from acts of sin, yet shews that he is forgetful of his baptism. For baptism is a covenant of a more pure life with God. Care therefore should be taken, that what was once done in baptism, should always be carried on in life really.’¹ *As members also in spiritual communion with a spiritual body*—how quickening the stimulus to all the helpful and active offices of Christian love and holy relationship—‘to love our brethren as our members, with whom by baptism we are knit together in one body ; to remain in the bond of concord, and in the unity of the Church ; not to follow strange religions, being mindful that we are baptized into Christ, to whom alone we are consecrated, and far separated and divided from all other Gods, worships, and religion—and, to be short—from all heresies !’² *Baptismal support also in temptation* is lively and full of power. “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved”—‘On this promise re-

⁵⁰ Rom. vi. 3—6. Exhortation to Sponsors in the Baptismal Service. Calv. in loco. Instit. iv. 15. Bullinger’s Sermons p. 195.

¹ On Col. ii. 12. See also his practical application on i. 2, iii. 3. Thus Calvin well reminds us of the use of this Sacrament—‘first to subserve our faith with him,—then our confession with men. Instit. iv. 15.

² 1 Cor. xii. 13—27. Bullinger’s Sermons, p. 195.

ceived by faith'—says Luther in his glowing strain—'depends our salvation. If we believe, our heart is strengthened by the Divine promise; and, though a believer should be bereft of all besides, this promise which he believes will never leave him. With this he will be able to withstand the adversary in all his assaults of his soul. It will be his stay in the hour of death, and his plea at the judgment-seat of God. In all his trials, it will be his comfort that he can say—'God is faithful to his promise. I have received the seal of it in baptism. If God be for me, who can be against me? Oh! how rich'—he adds—in the full flow of his joyous faith—'is the baptized Christian! Nothing can ruin him, but his own refusal to believe.'³ Every way does this holy Sacrament operate in cheering practical influence; the conscious investiture of privileges animating us to press for a real participation of them.

Not less valuable is the energy of the commemorative Sacrament. The remembrance of Christ here concentrated is the Christian's daily practical habit.⁴ The "shewing forth of his death" in the ordinance, is the badge of his daily

³ De Captiv. Babylonica Eccl.—The first work in which he calls Popery by its true name—the kingdom of Babylon—Milner iv. 472. Elsewhere he mentions a Christian woman—'quæ, quoties tentabatur, non nisi baptismo suo repugnabat—dicens brevissime—'Christiana sum.' Intellexit enim hostis—adds Luther—'*statim virtutem baptismi, et fidei, quæ in veritate promittentis pendebat, et fugit ab eo.*'—

⁴ Luke xxii. 19. Col. iii. 17.

profession—exhibiting his sole dependence—taking up the cross of his crucified Lord—“always bearing about in his body the dying of the Lord Jesus”⁵—thus manifesting his purpose, and taking his lot among ‘the Sacramental host of God’s elect.’⁶

If this practical power of the Sacraments were more visible among the followers of Christ, a far higher value would be placed upon them. The want of this active influence is a grievous error of defect, which it well becomes the disciples of Christ habitually and prayerfully to resist.

We now proceed from this extended discussion upon the general question of the Sacraments, to advert to the specific character, privileges, and obligations connected with each of them separately.

⁵ 1 Cor. xi. 26. with Matt. xvi. 24. 2 Cor. iv. 10.
1 Peter iv. 1, 2.

⁶ Cowper.

CHAP. V.

ON BAPTISM.

“WHAT mean ye by this service”—might be asked of us by many, who bring their children to Baptism only as an ecclesiastical rite—the custom of the place—and the ordinary mode of giving them their name. Baptismal instruction is therefore, as Bishop Burnet reminds us,⁷ greatly needed. Our people require for the most part, very full and clear expositions of the nature of this Sacrament, in the three-fold definition which our Church has given—*as a sign—a means—a seal—of grace*. As *a sign*, it marks our original guilt and impurity, our cleansing by the blood of Christ, and by the regenerating influence of his Spirit. As *a means*—it encourages the prayer of faith for the communication of his favour and grace. As *a seal* of the covenant of grace, by which we are mutually engaged to God, and God to us—it assures our faith of the mani-

⁷ Past. Care, ch. viii.

fested favour of God to His believing people and their seed.

That there should be any controversy as to the *subjects of Baptism*, is a matter of some marvel. There was none in the Apostolic, or in the Primitive Church, The circumcision of infants, and the substantial identity of circumcision with baptism⁸—the covenant promises of God extending to the believer's seed⁹—the clear encouragement of the Saviour in admitting children into his kingdom¹⁰—the unfettered baptismal commission extending to "all nations"¹¹—to infants therefore as a corporate part of nations—in conformity with this command, the Apostolical records of the

⁸ Col. ii. 11, 12.

⁹ Gen. xvii. 7. Acts ii. 39. Comp. Deut. x. 15. xxx. 6. Isa. xlv. 3. lxxv. 23. Jer. xxxii. 39—all sure promises to the spiritual seed of Abraham. Rom. iv. 16. Gal. iii. 15.

¹⁰ Mark x. 13—16.

¹¹ Matt. xxviii. 19. Our Translators have much obscured this commission, by rendering two totally distinct terms into one word *Teach*. It runs properly thus—make disciples (*μαθητευσατε*) baptizing them—Then teaching (*διδασκοντες*) them as the initiated members of the Church. Had teaching preceded Baptism, it would have effectually excluded infants. The terms and order as they now stand seem framed for their admission. Bullinger translates—'discipulate' (apologizing for the harshness of the term) 'sive facite mihi discipulos.' As the one nation disciplined by circumcision included infants, the extended commission to "all nations" would naturally also include them. Not that this discipling precludes the obligation of giving previous instruction to the adult. But it opens the door to those, who are necessarily incapable of receiving it. See an interesting and valuable Letter of the Martyr Philpot—Writings, pp. 271—284, Parker Society's Edition.

baptism of whole households¹²—the acknowledged practice of the early Christians—these particulars combined, strengthen, and confirm the declaration of our Church, that ‘the Baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ.’¹³ If we are called upon for a plain command, we are ready to adduce it. God charged his people upon the strictest penalty, to bring their children into covenant with himself—¹⁴ *and that by the seal of the Gospel*¹⁵—*thus realizing our interest in the promise.* Until therefore the repeal of the statute, and the sentence of their exclusion be produced, we will thankfully hold to the judgment of Bishop Hall—‘Children are the blessing of parents ; and Baptism is the blessing of children and parents.’¹⁶

The Sacrament is not—properly speaking—an ordinance administered in the Church, but the door of admission *into the Church*—the qualification and means of communion with it.¹⁷ Its Divine institution sufficiently attests its spiritual character. Yet if the ordinance be spiritual, the subject must be spiritually interested in it. The infant must be regarded as virtually a covenanting party—professedly brought under the obligations, claiming the privileges, of the covenant, and, according

¹² Acts xvi. 15, 33. 1 Cor. i. 16.

¹³ Art. xxvii.

¹⁴ Gen. xvii. 9—14.

¹⁵ Rom. iv. 11.

¹⁶ Epist. Dec. v. 4.

¹⁷ Hooker, B. iii. c. i. 6.

to its capacity, inheriting these privileges. That he is capable of these privileges is evident. As a child of wrath, he is capable of acceptance.¹⁸ As born in sin, he is capable of regeneration¹⁹—Else as an unreconciled—unrenewed sinner, how could we conceive of his salvation? Without this spiritual interest, Baptism cannot be a spiritual ordinance; nor can it belong to a spiritual church. The worship as a formal ordinance must be abominable to his sight, who “requireth truth in the inward part.”²⁰ The prayers and thanksgivings are grounded upon no spiritual warrant. There is therefore no exercise of faith—consequently no acceptance—no fruitful result.

Admitting however the spiritual view of the ordinance, all is consistent. *Its privileges* are therefore accordant with this character—an investiture with all the blessings of the Christian covenant.²¹

¹⁸ Gen. xvii. 7. ut supra.

¹⁹ Luke i. 15.

²⁰ Ps. li. 6.

²¹ Comp. Rom. ix. 4, 5. These privileges belonged to the Lord's visible people—*not as converted* (for the contrary was their palpable character, verses 3, 6.) but as circumcised. Comp. Deut. xiv. 1. Thus our Lord gave the same investiture to those, who had manifestly no true and personal interest in the blessings (Luke xv. 2, 31.) Our Church therefore, assuming the identity of circumcision and baptism, and not doubting that the privileges under a more enlarged dispensation, were at least equally full—details the Jewish privileges as the substantial appendage of Christian Baptism (Catechism.) The title in both cases was the admission into covenant with God; though, unless it was pleaded and wrought out in faith, it was virtually a title without possession. We may observe also in connexion with this subject, the *distributive individuality*, with which the Apostle invested the *several*

The spiritual grace of this ordinance is 'a death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness'²²—a real, not merely a relative change.

Yet experience and observation too plainly prove, that its privilege and grace are not *necessarily and in all cases* connected with the external administration. We surely can only expect the blessing, where God is honoured in the improvement of the ordinance, and where the *ends* for which he appointed it are duly regarded. The design is, that the child of Abraham—the only true member of the Church—may here plead and make good his children's interest jointly with his

members of the visible Church with Baptismal privileges—"As many of *you*" (not some—or as elsewhere (Phil. i. 7.) all, *en masse*,) "as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." (Gal. iii. 27.) Would the Apostle have hesitated in making this investiture a matter of thanksgiving? Wherein would this differ from the thanksgiving severally pronounced in our service respecting baptized infants? If this investiture is warranted in the case of Judaizing, backsliding professors (iv. 19, 20. v. 4, 15. Comp. Daven. on Col. i. 2.) much more is it in the case of Infants, whose title to the ordinance as a means of acceptance is undoubted, and against whom no open ground of exclusion can be shewn. Similarly he invests the members of the Colossian Church with the full privileges of Baptism, though manifestly prepared to anticipate the voidance of the spiritual grace from want of stedfastness to their obligations. (ii. 12, with i. 23.) This phraseology fully justifies *the letter* of our service, as applied to the visible church. *The spirit* of the service, as applied to the true church, is to be explained upon the general consistent principle of spiritual and acceptable worship. But we cannot forbear to admire the precise Scriptural accuracy of our Liturgical service. The difficulties, which after all may remain upon some minds, belong, we conceive, not so much to the Church as to the Scripture—to an imperfect apprehension of the popular language and statements of the inspired writers.²² Catechism.

own in the favour and grace of God. It is with him not merely *a dedicatory*²³—but chiefly *a covenanting service*²⁴—pleading and embracing for his child the promises of grace. In affixing therefore the seal of God's own covenant in his appointed ordinance, we give thanks, *as in duty bound*, for the child's interest in this large expanse of mercy. For whether the grace be only visibly sealed or actually vouchsafed; it is alike in both cases confirmed to our faith, and therefore a just ground of present confidence, and of grateful acknowledgment.

Our good Lord does “indeed meet those that remember him in his ways.”²⁵ He honoureth his own ordinances, and therefore in the faithful and reverential use of them, the prayer of faith is quickened to look up for the blessing. This, as far as it goes, is encouraging truth. But we stand upon far higher and firmer ground. It is not what a gracious Sovereign may do in the exercise of his own will; or how a God of love “delighteth in mercy.” But it is what a God of faithfulness—a God in covenant—hath bound himself to do. Faith claims our interest on the warrant of the promise. What more has the believing parent for himself than the covenant promise—“I will be a God to thee”? What less has he for his children—“*and to thy seed after*

²³ 1 Sam. i. 26—28.

²⁴ Gen. xvii. 9, 10.

²⁵ Is. lxiv. 5.

•

thee ?"²⁶ 'In this one word,' as Calvin emphatically remarks—'is contained their salvation.'²⁷ And is not baptism the seal of this promise both to parents and children ? "This is the token of my covenant."

Indeed Calvin's views are so beaming with the encouragements of the Gospel, that we give them in full for the support and establishment of parental faith—'This sign of God, communicated to a child, like the impression of a seal, confirms the promise given to a pious parent, declaring that the Lord will be a God, not only to him, but to his seed ; and that he is determined to exercise his goodness and favour not only towards him, but towards his posterity, even to a thousand generations. The display here given of the Lord's goodness, first furnishes abundant matter for setting forth his glory, and then fills the godly breast with no common joy, stirring up the return of more ardent love to such an indulgent Father, in whom they discover such a care to their posterity on their account.'—Again—'How sweet to godly minds to be assured, not only by the word, but by a sight before their own eyes, that they have so much favour with their heavenly Father, that their children are cared for by him. This is indeed to see him take upon himself the character of a most provident father, who not even after their death lays

²⁶ Gen. xvii. 7.

²⁷ Instit. Lib. iv. cap. xv. 20.

aside his care for their children, but consults and provides for them.' ²⁸ To the parent therefore who realizes this solid ground of faith and hope, Baptism will be no mere form—no duty of conscience—but a privileged ordinance. What is it to see our child, in the right use of this Sacrament, sealed with a visible interest in the glorious covenant! 'In this sight,'—as a valuable old writer observes, a 'parent might more rejoice, than if he could make his child the heir of the world.' ²⁹

But if this be the firm warrant of faith—is it honourable to God—nay, is it not robbing ourselves of a precious treasure—to be content with a name and shadow, when God giveth the substance;—to come with flickering hope, instead of assured confidence? Obviously a doubting spirit—or positive unbelief—substituting uncertainty and suspicion in the place of the appropriate act and thanksgiving of faith—so far annuls the desired blessing. For if "faith is made void, the promise is made of none effect." ³⁰ On the other hand, a Christian brings his child to the font for the sign, seal, and blessing of spiritual regeneration, in the assurance of his joint interest in the promises of the covenant. The sponsor at the same time, in dependence on Divine grace and strength, engages in the child's name to renounce the service of his enemies, 'to believe in God,

²⁸ Instit. iv. cap. xvi. 9, 32.

²⁹ Taylor on Tit. iii. 5.

³⁰ Rom. iv. 14.

and to serve him,' joining in prayer for the confirmation of these privileges to the child. We might ask—pondering the helplessness of the infant—the faith of those most deeply interested in him—the cheering manifestation of Divine favour towards him—does the world present so interesting—so affecting a sight? But it is more to our purpose to observe it, as exhibiting a clear and animating warrant of faith, most honourable to the sacred ordinance. God honours his own name—his sovereignty in the gift of faith—his faithfulness in the acceptance of his own gift.

Calvin indeed truly reminds us, 'that Baptism is of no avail, so long as the promise offered to us in it, and without which it is nothing, lies neglected.'³¹ Indolence grasps nothing. Presumption only seizes a shadow. Faith substantiates the reality in all its practical energy—lives on it—lives by it. Yet God is a Sovereign even in the exercise of his faithfulness; true to his promised blessing, but reserving to himself the time and the mode of making it good. The ordinance may be rather a seal than a means—confirming faith in what God will do, rather than directly working at the time. Yet is it not the less sure—"The vision is for an appointed time; though it tarry, wait for it; for at the end it shall surely come; it shall not tarry."³²

³¹ Inst. iv. cap. xv. 17.

³² Hab. ii. 3.

Let us then once again steadily ponder the case. 'God has engaged himself to be the God of the seed of believers. His Sacramental Ordinance is the seal of this promise.³³ The believer brings his child to this ordinance, as the exercise of his faith upon the faithfulness of God. Let him *daily* put his finger upon this promise—*Remember the word unto thy servant, upon which thou hast caused me to hope.*³⁴ This is—as Augustine said of his mother—'bringing before God his own hand-writing.' Will he not *remember his word*? *Faith may be tried—perhaps long tried.* But "he abideth faithful. He cannot deny himself."³⁵ Faith trusts—not what the eye sees, but what the word promises.'³⁶ Let there be quietness under his will, combined with diligence in his means, and confident expectation of his blessing. The precious fruits of faith, energy, and consistency will appear in due season.

Yet if the harvest be blasted, many reasons may explain this afflictive result—all charging the fault on man—none reflecting on God. Many Christians have no well-considered definite apprehensions of the ordinance. The only distinct meaning which they attach to it is, as an admission to the visible Church; thus reducing it to a formal ordinance, conveying no spiritual blessing.

³³ Gen. xvii. 9, 10 with Acts ii. 38, 39.

³⁴ Ps. cxix. 49.

³⁵ 2 Tim. ii. 13.

³⁶ Author's Expos. of Ps. cxix. on v, 49. 16th Edition.

If it be not acknowledged as a means to an end; we marvel not that no grace was given, when none was expected. This indefinite view of the Sacrament goes far toward paralyzing its efficiency. Where the promise is not apprehended, it cannot be pleaded. The interest in it is therefore made void by ignorance. The hand that should have grasped the covenant is palsied. Parental anxiety for the child's welfare may be in exercise. There may be also a general conception of the gracious mercy of our God. But if the ground of this covenant be not realized, it is the prayer of seriousness, of earnestness, of feeling—*not of faith*—not of that unwavering faith, which alone is acceptable.³⁷ The grace is sealed up in the promises, but the present interest in it is nullified. In other cases the apprehension may be clear. The exercise of faith may be at the moment *apparently* satisfactory. But the neglect of means—of holy example—fatherly reproof—careful discipline—proves the faith to have been presumption. True confidence is not an isolated act, but an habitual practical principle; not an impulse at the time of the ordinance, but a flow of Christian energy and diligence; actively waiting for the gracious manifestation in a successive course of means connected with the ordinance, and drawing life and encouragement from it. In this—as in the other instances—“ye shall know”—saith God

³⁷ See James i. 6, 7.

—"my breach of promise."³⁸ Yet is there here no infringement of Divine faithfulness, but a chastening rebuke of self-indulgence and neglect.

The holy Sacrament however in its genuine character and Christian influence is full of life and hope, even in the midst of present conflict and discouragement. Leaning upon our baptismal staff, we go on our way strengthened, invigorated; "against hope believing in hope;"³⁹ pleading, but waiting; subduing impatience and self-will by rest in the promise of our God; and strenuously exercising our faith in laborious patience, until the children of the covenant shall manifest their heavenly birth in a believing reception of the great salvation of the gospel.⁴⁰

But we must now advert to the perplexing difficulty connected with the indiscriminate administration of Baptism. Let it be observed, that we are Ministers of spiritual ordinances; yet—*by Divine appointment*—in a mixed and visible Church.⁴¹ 'For lack of diligent observing this difference between the Church of God—mystical and visible'—observes our judicious Hooker—"the oversights are neither few nor light, that have been committed."⁴² We must admit with him, that 'the self-same men may belong both to the synagogue of Satan, and to the *visible* Church of Jesus Christ.'

³⁸ Num. xiv. 34.

³⁹ Rom. iv. 18.

⁴⁰ John i. 12, 13.

⁴¹ Matt. xiii. 25, 47; xxv. 1, 2. John xv. 2.

⁴² Book iii. i. 8, 9.

Our Great Master commands us to instruct, exhort, warn, exercise discipline. *But he forbids us to separate the mass.*⁴³ Hence—as Archbishop Whitgift states—‘good and evil, clean and unclean, holy and profane, pass through Baptism.’⁴⁴ Yet, though the recipients be formal, the ordinances must be spiritual. To conceive of acceptable ordinances for hypocrites and unbelievers is an anomaly.⁴⁵ To generalize the service of the Church, so as to meet the temperament of “the mixed multitude,” would be not only to rob the true Christian of his warranted and enlarged confidence in “the promises of God” applied “by us;”⁴⁶ but we should thus approach God himself with a worship that could not be pleasing to him.⁴⁷ It is obviously therefore our duty, so far as possible, not to lower the standard of worship, but to elevate the standard of the worshippers. If the ordinance be profaned—as, alas ! it is most fearfully—on whom lies the responsibility ? Not on us, who, as the Ministers of Christ, can only dispense the ordinances of his own spiritual Church, but on those who make these ordinances a mockery. No other than spiritual ordinances—administered in a spiritual manner, and for spiritual purposes—could ever be sanctioned by Him, who hath written upon the threshold of his temple—“God is a Spirit, and

⁴³ Col. i. 28. 2 Tim. iv. 2. 1 Cor. v. with Matt. xiii. 29, 30.

⁴⁴ Answer to an Admonition, p. 621.

⁴⁵ 2 Cor. vi. 14—16.

⁴⁶ Ib. i. 20.

⁴⁷ Heb. xi. 6.

they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth.”⁴⁸

Baptism indeed, though the privilege of Christians, is the duty of all. If the command to baptize be universal,¹ so must also be the obligation to be baptized. Unbelievers therefore are bound now, as under the old dispensation,² to present their children to God in solemn worship and professed covenanting. But it is their sin, that they perform this bounden obligation in an ungodly and unacceptable manner. That God *may, in his free mercy as a sovereign*, honour his own ordinance, we deny not. Conceiving with Hooker—‘that God hath ordained Baptism in favour of mankind,’³ we accord with the judgment of the Ancient Church, as expressed by Cyprian and his sixty-six colleagues to Fidus—‘Our sentence, dearest brother, in the council was, *that none by us should be prohibited from Baptism and the grace of God, who is merciful and kind to all.*’⁴ Yet still with this admission—not what God may do—but *what he is engaged to do, and what he requires us to do*—is the alone ground of acceptable worship.

It is this ground that forms the distinctive character of our Baptismal Service. Not that it

⁴⁸ John iv. 24

² Gen. xvii. 9, 10.

¹ Matt. xxviii. 19.

³ Book v. lxiv. 5.

⁴ Cyprian’s Works, Ep. lix. ad Fidum. Compare Milner’s Church History, i. 429, 430.

has any specific individuality. It is a part of a consistent whole—of a Liturgy framed as a spiritual service for spiritual worshippers. Such were the Framers themselves. They knew that “the Father seeketh *such*” *only* “to worship him.”⁵ They did not therefore frame their prayers in loose and vague generality that would suit all alike; They laboured to give substantive expression to Christian faith, hope, desire, love, humility, thankfulness. They took an high, yet not sublimated standard—aiming, in fact, at nothing more than was necessarily involved in the essence of godly worship and exhibiting, for the conviction of formalists, the true spirit of that worship.

Our Baptismal formulary is framed in strict accordance with this principle. It attributes nothing to the Sacrament, but what appears necessary to an ordinance appointed by Christ as a channel of spiritual blessings to his Church. The ordinance is itself “the seal of the righteousness of the faith,”⁶—that is—of God’s way of acceptance apprehended by faith. The seal confirms the promise in the exercise of faith. The presenting the child is an act of faith. Prayer is offered. Promises are pleaded. Engagements are contracted. The seal is then affixed. And if our God hath given the seal, and that seal is affixed in faith, ought we to doubt his promise?

⁵ John iv. 23.

⁶ Rom. iv. 11.

In the case of the adult, personal faith is the indispensable requisite.⁷ In the infant's case, faith in its behalf—such as was honoured in similar cases of helplessness,⁸ will here be equally encouraged. For be it remembered—that—apart from these collateral instances of encouragement—it was vicarious faith,⁹ that realized the Saviour's tender love to infants, and his gracious reception of them as the children of his kingdom. The children "*brought to Christ*" were counted, as if they had "*come to him.*"¹⁰ The reasoning of our Church upon this most affecting history is not less conclusive than encouraging. Yet the encouragement is not derived from the innocence of the children, or from the innate virtue of the ordinance, but from the unchanging power and love of the Saviour.¹¹ His blessing could not be then an empty form. Nor will it be so now. Will not he do as tenderly, as effectually, for children now brought to him in the prayer of faith, as he did then? 'Doubt ye not therefore'—says our Church—'but earnestly believe.'

We see then every way the character of our Baptismal Service—as a service of faith. The declared regeneration of the child is the expres-

⁷ Mark xvi. 16. Acts viii. 37.

⁸ See Matt. viii. 6—10. ix. 2. xv. 22—28. Mark ix. 23—27.

⁹ *Fides susceptorum*—Augustine. See Martyr Philpot's Writings, p. 106. Compare Bp. Sparrow's *Rationale*, p. 237:

¹⁰ Mark x. 13, 14.

¹¹ Heb. xiii. 8.

sion of the believer's confidence in the faithfulness of God and the love of the Saviour. If the prayers have been the prayers, and the presentment the act, of faith; then surely—admitting the ordinance to be an '*effectual* quickening sign and means of grace'¹²—the thanksgiving is the natural expression of the large, well-warranted expectation of faith. It is only unscriptural, when it is separated from the service; or when the *whole* service is made a mockery of form. The responsibility therefore—as in the formal use of the Liturgy—rests with those, whose ignorance or wilfulness makes it unscriptural. We greatly admire our Church's high and exclusive standard. For how could she descend to a lower or broader level, without accrediting an half-believing—half-hearted confidence?

Suited therefore as the office is, *and must be*, exclusively for the use of a spiritual church, the unspiritual use of it is in reality the abuse, wholly beside the end intended; and therefore determines nothing of its true character, and effects nothing in its result. The conclusion therefore that is drawn from it of the universal efficacy of the ordinance, is wholly unwarranted, as if it could be the same service in the abuse as in the improvement of it. The assertion that *every child* here sprinkled is through and by this sprinkling spiritually regenerated, links the Divine blessing with the external

¹² Art. xxv. and Catechism.

ceremony—identifies the due reception with the accredited administration—confounds the difference between truth and error, light and darkness;—between the visible and the mystical church—a most unscriptural and deadly delusion. *The true doctrine of baptismal regeneration*—that is, the true connection of baptism with regeneration, is (as we have before suggested) *as a sign* marking the nature of the blessing—a *seal* of its actual promise—a *means* of its communication according to the sovereign pleasure and grace of our God. We are far therefore from calling (as Dr. Pusey insinuates ¹³) ‘Baptismal Regeneration deadening.’ The perversion indeed, or the formal statement, of the doctrine is most ‘deadening.’ But the genuine Scriptural doctrine, as we have just stated it, is most animating. It honours the Divine ordinance in a right apprehension and diligent improvement of it; a rich channel of grace, but having no grace innate in itself—working or giving nothing of itself.

We remark briefly upon the enlivening and practical influence of this Sacrament upon the recipient himself.

The child in his first dawning intelligence finds ‘his name put into the gospel grant’ ¹⁴—himself therefore a dedicated child—taken out of the evil world, and pledged to the service of God. To

¹³ Tracts on Baptism, p. 177.

¹⁴ Matthew Henry’s Treatise on Baptism, p. 120.

encourage his faithfulness, he feels himself surrounded with the special guardianship of a covenant-keeping God, introduced into his family, commended to the prayers and sympathies of every member of the household, brought under the blessing of all the means of grace—specially under the teaching of “the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make him wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus.”¹⁵ *But he must not sleep insensible of his obligations.* His responsibilities are now commenced. ‘The sign of the cross’ on his forehead will never be effaced from the eye of God; nor the day of his Baptismal consecration blotted out of his book. In the obligations and privileges of the covenant into which he has entered, are contained all the quickening motives to personal devotedness. And therefore his unfaithfulness will not be judged as the heathen, who “knew not his Lord’s will;” but as “the servant, who knew his Lord’s will, neither did according to his will, and who shall be beaten with many stripes.”¹⁶

Thus P. Henry, ‘in dealing with his children about their spiritual state, took hold of them very much by the handle of their infant baptism; and frequently inculcated upon them, that they were born in God’s house, and were betimes dedicated and given up to him, and therefore were obliged

¹⁵ 2 Tim. iii. 15.

¹⁶ Luke xii. 47, 48.

to be his servants.’¹⁷ Thus his son bears his personal testimony to the value of this ordinance. ‘I cannot but take occasion’ (said he) ‘to express my gratitude to God for my infant baptism; not only, as it was an early admission into the visible body of Christ; but as it furnished my pious parents with a good argument (and as I trust through grace a prevailing argument) for an early dedication of my own self to God in my childhood. If God has wrought any good work upon my soul, I desire with humble thankfulness to acknowledge the moral influence of my infant baptism upon it.’ ‘As to the *real influence of baptism*’—he adds, however, in another place—‘when the children grow up, we are sure that their baptismal regeneration, without something else, will not bring them to heaven; and yet it may be urged in praying to God to give them grace, and in persuading them to submit to it.’¹⁸ To the tender susceptible believer, the seal of Baptism would be a powerful confirmation of the promise, when looking upon it in the exercise of present faith.

We add a few words upon a subject often of some perplexity—*the office of Sponsors*. We do not pretend to place this office upon the ground of express Scripture. But it is too much to assert, that all that is without Scripture precept is therefore anti-scriptural. Nay—it may be essen-

¹⁷ Life, p. 83. Williams’ Ed. Compare Psalm cxvi. 16.

¹⁸ Treatise on Baptism, pp. 118, 130, 131.

tially Scriptural in principle, though utterly devoid of literal authority. The office, as is well known, had its origin in the exercise of Christian love; by which foundling children of heathen parents, or those whom the fiery trial of persecution had deprived of their natural guardians, were taken up in the true spirit of our Master's tenderness, presented to baptism, and trained in the Church of God. The fruitful advantages of the parental care soon made that, which before was a spontaneous exercise of individual sympathy, a general prescript of the Church. While parents were fully allowed to give their witness and pledge, yet the uncertainty of their security in these perilous times demanded increased protection; and two spiritual fathers were provided for the male, and two mothers for the female, in order that even in the partial bereavement of the spiritual as well as the natural guardians, provision might still be made for the interests of the child. This office appears to have been taken by the deacons and deaconesses of the Church. No such office in its primitive distinctness now existing, our Church has devolved it upon those who give the most accredited pledge of sincerity—the communicants of her parochial congregations.¹⁹

But apart from this exercise of Christian love,

¹⁹ Bingham, Book xi. ch. viii. See Canon xxix. Compare Archbishop Grindal's Injunction to his Clergy. Works, p. 126. Parker Soc. Edn.

—we conceive, that the sponsorial engagement *in some form*—though *in the letter* an appointment of the Church, yet *in the spirit of it*, is an essential appendage to the Sacrament. If Baptism be, as we have shewn, a covenanting ordinance, the infant, as a contracting party, must appear by his surety, who may represent in his own person his fidelity to his promises. The clear explicit recognition of the obligation implied in the ordinance is an important part of this mutual engagement. The difficulties of this sacred proxy, arising as they do from misconception, admit of a ready explanation. There is no involving our own in the child's wilful responsibility; inasmuch as the obligations contracted on his behalf are those, 'which, when he comes of age himself is bound to perform,'²⁰ and such as to a reasonable apprehension are so fraught with advantage, that it might be fairly presumed, he will be most ready to acknowledge and confirm them. The furniture of supply for the performance of the Sponsorial obligation, is that Divine strength, which is ever at hand for the application to every Christian exercise; abundantly sufficient for every demand. To covenant therefore for children, as Abraham did for his seed²¹—as Hannah for her child²²—that the Lord shall be their God—is both a 'reasonable and acceptable service.' The Exhortation at the close of the Baptismal Service is a

²⁰ Catechism.

²¹ Gen. xvii. 7—10.

²² 1 Sam. 26—28.

valuable directory for the discharge of these important responsibilities. Much may be done by continual prayer, affectionate inspection and watchfulness—enquiry from time to time of their parents—an occasional word of Christian remembrance, or a letter of parental interest. There can be no doubt, but that in ordinary cases, sponsorial intercourse wisely and diligently improved, would have more influence, both with parents and children, than where no such relationship existed. An additional pledge would be given for the religious education of the child. Christian parents would rejoice to have a brother or sister pledged to the spiritual interests of their children. The bonds of unity and love in the body of Christ will be cemented and strengthened.

For the due efficiency of this office, we must, however, “know no man after the flesh.” No consideration of convenience, relationship, or worldly advantage must influence. The one determining principle of our choice must be—‘Who will be most helpful to me in the work of training up the child for God?’ There may not be any misconception of the institution. But let it not be considered an empty and fruitless vow. When practicable, it would be very important, that no Sponsors or Parents should present themselves at the font without previous Ministerial instruction; that they may under the Lord’s blessing attend upon the ordinance with a penitent, upright, believing and thank-

ful spirit, presenting a holy and acceptable as well as "a reasonable service."

It is painful indeed to reflect on the fearful perversion of this office. Yet our Church is guiltless of the sad results. If her Ministers are duly careful in admitting to the Holy Communion, this wholesome discipline would do much towards checking the abuse of the institution, by showing its valuable use. Protesting therefore as she does against the evil, and providing therefore all the security in her power against it, she is no more answerable for its results, than the law of the land is responsible for all the violations against it. The Church—so far as in her lies—maintains the due order and dignity of her ordinances, and never countenances the drawing of a promiscuous multitude within her external pale, by the compromise of the sacredness of her Sacraments, to the serious injury of true religion.

But let us not forget the importance also of a baptismal education, as the means of giving to this holy ordinance its full, permanent, and practical influence. The godly exhortations of Bishop Jewel are full of weight and interest: 'A father must put his child in mind of his baptism; and teach him, that it is a covenant of God's mercy to us, of our duty to God: that it is a mystery of our salvation; that our soul is so washed with the blood of Christ, as the water of Baptism washeth our body. Let us look on our children,

as upon the great blessings of God. They are the Lord's vessels ordained to honour : let us keep them clean. They are Christ's lambs, and sheep of his flock : let us lead them forth into wholesome pasture. They are the seed-plot of heaven ; let us water them, that God may give the increase. By you they are born into the world. Be careful also, that by your means they may be begotten unto God. You are careful to train them in nurture and comely behaviour of the body. Seek also to fashion their minds unto godliness. You have brought them to the fountain of baptism, to receive the mark of Christ. Bring them up in knowledge, and watch over them, that they be not lost. So shall they be confirmed, and will keep the promise they have made, and will grow unto perfect age in Christ.' ²³

Is it not from the neglect of this holy nurture, that many are called into the Kingdom in the dawn of day, visibly sealed as the children of God, and planted in the nursery of his Church ; and yet have grown up without the apprehension of a single Baptismal privilege, or the practical acknowledgment of one Baptismal obligation ? Though their God has so graciously acknowledged their relation to him, and laid claim to them with such wondrous condescension ; yet has there been no confession of the character he has conferred

²³ On the Sacraments, pp. 281, 282. Comp. Baxter's Pract. Works, Folio, i. 557—560.

upon them—no honouring of its attendant responsibilities. It is a valuable testimony of Mr. Baxter—‘I have always seen, that God hath most blessed the children of those parents, who have brought them up most sensible of their Baptismal vow, and making conscience of performing it.’ Let the shame of the neglect combine with the encouragement of the promise, to quicken diligence in this most responsible trust—professing in this sacred work our own personal consecration (for who can give his child freely and sincerely, except he hath “first given his own self unto the Lord?”) and giving our pledge, that our children should be the Lord’s for ever—“a seed to serve him—counted to the Lord for a generation.”²⁴

²⁴ Ps. xxii. 30. In some of the American churches, the baptized children are assembled periodically in the church, with their natural and spiritual guardians, and addressed by their Pastor upon the obligation of their vow. We could wish that similar ecclesiastical assemblies might be transferred into our Established system; or at least, that the spirit of this interesting ceremony would imbue our ordinary Ministrations with a more frequent and affectionate enforcement of baptismal responsibilities.

CHAP. VI.

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

OUR course of instruction naturally passes from the initial sacrament to that which exhibits the complete privilege of Church-membership—the one marking the commencement, the other the support, of the spiritual life.

This sacrament connects itself with the great doctrines of the Gospel. Man as a sinner was condemned under the everlasting curse of the broken law. God accepts the vicarious death of his own Son as his Surety. The great Sufferer himself upon the eve of his death appointed this ordinance as a perpetual memorial of his acceptable sacrifice, and as a seal of the covenanted blessings, which it has obtained for his Church.

This memorial eminently illustrates the spiritual character of the ordinance. 'The remembrance which is thus ordained' (to use the beautiful language of Bishop Ridley)—'as the author thereof is Christ—both God and man ; so by the

Almighty power of God it far passeth all kinds of remembrances, that any other man is able to make, either of himself, or of any other thing. For whosoever receiveth this holy sacrament thus ordained in remembrance of Christ, *he receiveth therewith either death or life.*²⁵ Cherishing this spiritual remembrance, we shall be preserved from the snare—‘lest of the memory, it be made a sacrifice; lest of a communion, a private eating; lest of two parts, we have but one—instead of a heavenly refection, a gross carnal feeding.’²⁶

The distinctness and singular value of this ordinance is, that it appears to combine much of the real blessing of the other means. If preaching is to represent Christ crucified; to “do this in remembrance of him” is to “show forth his death until he come.”²⁷ ‘Thus also (as Dean Comber justly remarks) ‘that which is more compendiously expressed in the conclusion of our prayers—*through Jesus Christ our Lord*—is more fully and more vigorously set out in this most holy sacrament; wherein we intercede on earth, in imitation of, and in conjunction with, the great intercession of our High Priest in heaven; pleading here in the virtue and merits of the same sacrifice, which he doeth there for us.’²⁸

²⁵ Brief Declaration of the Lord’s Supper. Works. p. 8.

²⁶ Homily on Sacrament, Part I.

²⁷ Gal. iii. 1. with Luke xxli. 19. 1 Cor. xi. 26.

²⁸ Introd. to Communion Service. See also Wheatley’s Introduction, totidem verbis.

This ordinance is therefore equally precious and honourable as a command to be obeyed, and a privilege to be enjoyed. It is an exercise of faith—a remembrance of love—a covenant of dedication. Its primary blessing is the presence of our Divine Lord—not carnal and corporal, but Sacramental and spiritual. We might have said—*real* and spiritual. For inasmuch as spiritual things are as real in their nature as sensible objects, *the real presence* in the Sacrament is a Protestant and Scriptural, no less than a Romish, doctrine. Yet we fully accord with Bishop Burnet; ‘that our first Reformers judged right concerning the use of the phrase *real presence*, that it were better to be let fall than to be continued; since the use of it, and that idea, which does naturally arise from the common acceptation of it, may stick deeper, and feed superstition more, than all those larger explanations that are given to it can be able to cure.’²⁹

²⁹ On Art. xxviii. ‘The Church of England has wisely foreborne to use the term of *real presence*, in all the works, that are set forth by her authority. We neither find it recommended in the Liturgy, nor the Articles, nor the Homilies, nor the Church’s nor Nowell’s Catechism. So that if any Church of England man use it, he does more than the Church directs him. If any reject it, he has the Church’s example to warrant him.’ Dr. Aldrich’s ‘Reply to two discourses lately printed at Oxford. concerning the adoration of our blessed Saviour, in the Holy Eucharist.’ Oxford 1687. The expression ‘real and essential presence’ harmlessly occurred in the explanation of kneeling at the Lord’s Supper, joined to the Sacramental Service. The whole however was expunged at Queen Elizabeth’s accession, and, when subsequently restored at the last Review of the Liturgy, ‘*real and essential presence*’ were exchanged for *corporal presence*.’ See Wheatley.

Zwingli appear to have considered the ordinance as nothing else than a commemoration by external symbols, without any distinct Sacramental efficacy.³⁰ Now this is partial truth; but, stopping short of the full meaning and character of the Sacrament, it becomes grievous error. We admit indeed that 'the creatures of bread and wine' are the holy symbols of the body and blood of Christ, and that he has so ordained them as the commemoration of his death. But we add to this the Sacramental blessing, that in the due reception of these emblems, the faithful communicant is made one with Christ, that he is a partaker—though in a spiritual and heavenly manner—yet '*verily and indeed*'—of the body and blood of Christ,³¹ that (again to adopt the language of our Homily) 'in the supper of the Lord there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign—no untrue figure of a thing absent; but as the Scripture saith—the table of the Lord—the bread and cup of the Lord—the memory of Christ—the annunciation of his death—yea—the *communion of the body and blood of the Lord, in a marvellous incorporation*, which by the operation of the Holy Ghost (the very bond of our conjunction with Christ) is through faith wrought in the souls of the faithful, whereby not only their souls live to eternal life,

³⁰ Op. ii. fol. 213. Comp. Mosheim. Cent. xvi. Part ii. ch. ii. 10, 12.

³¹ Catechism, Communion Service. 1 Cor. x. 16. Compare Bishop Horaley's Charges, pp. 162, 163.

but they surely trust to win their bodies a resurrection to immortality.' ³² Archbishop Cranmer gives the same full and Scriptural statement of this most important truth ; the more valuable, as explanatory of his matured and established judgment—'When I say and repeat many times in my book, that the body of Christ is present in them that worthily receive the Sacrament ; lest any should mistake my words, and think that I mean, that, though Christ be not corporally in the outward signs, yet he is corporally in the persons that duly receive them ; this is to advertize the reader, that I mean no such thing. But my meaning is, that the force, the grace, the virtue, and the benefits of Christ's body that was crucified, and of his blood that was shed for us, be really and effectually present with them *that duly receive* the Sacrament. *But all this I understand of his spiritual presence.* (See Matt. xxviii. 20. xviii. 20. John vi. 56.) Nor no more is he truly, and corporally, and really present in the due Ministration of the Lord's Supper, than he is in the due ministration of Baptism—that is to say—in *both spiritually by grace.*' ³³ We could not desire

³² Homily on Sacrament, Part 1.

³³ Preface to the Answer to Gardiner, p. 30. It is interesting to compare with this statement the last judgment of the profoundly learned Melancthon in his Epistle to the Count Palatine 1559—as a counterpart with Cranmer—exhibiting a Christian mind gradually emerging from the mists of error into a luminous apprehension of the same Divine Truth (Scott's contin. of Milner ii. 40, 245, iii. 98.)—'Et voca-

a more instructive exposition of our Sacramental Service than is here given by one of its Framers. There is none of that refined mysticism or hyperbolical ecstasy, which revolts rather than edifies us in the Patristic writings.³⁴ But the spiritual indwelling and union with the Saviour are explained in strict consonance with his own words to mean, that the substance of his merit and sacrifice is spiritually present and effectually applied. In this participation Christ (as Bishop Ridley declares) 'doth feed spiritually the receiver in faith with all the merits of his blessed death and passion.'³⁴ 'At this his table' (as our unctious Homily expresses it) we receive not only the outward Sacrament, but the spiritual thing also; not the figure, but the truth; not the shadow only, but the body; not to death, but to life; not to destruction, but to Salvation.³⁶

bulum *κοινωνία* declarandum est—Non dicit (Paulus) mutari naturam panis, ut Papistæ dicunt. Non dicit, ut Bremenses, panem esse substantiale corpus Christi—non dicit, ut Herhusius, panem esse verum corpus Christi; sed esse *κοινωνίαν* id est—*hoc, quo consociatio cum corpore Christi.* De Controv. Cœnæ. Consilia. ii. 379. Comp. Homily ut supra. Comp. Bishop Ridley's works, p. 236. Foxe vi. 273. vii. 80. Bishop Hall's Works, ix. 437—444.

³⁴ See Dr. Pusey's Sermon on the Eucharist, pp. 8, 9, 15—17. And contrast Hooker's edifying and devotional statement. B. v. lxxvii. 12.

³⁵ See the first Disputation in Cambridge, not given in Bishop Ridley's Works—Foxe vi. 311. To this end King Edward's Catechism teaches—'Faith is the mouth of the soul, whereby we receive this very heavenly meat, full both of salvation and immortality, dealt among us by the means of the Holy Ghost.'

³⁶ Homily on Sacrament, ut supra.

Truly refreshing is it to mark the clearness and unction, with which our great Reformation-Fathers bear witness to this weighty truth. We add one further testimony—‘When the Minister’—speaks Bishop Hooper, ‘delivereth unto me that is in his power to deliver—to say—the bread and wine—rehearsing the words of Christ’s institution, the Holy Ghost delivereth unto my faith that, which is mounted and ascended into heaven—the precious body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ spiritually, and not corporally. So doth the merits of this precious body in heaven feed my poor wretched soul upon the earth, and no contradiction or impossibility for Christ’s body to do so. It may be in heaven, and yet extend his virtue by the operation of the Holy Ghost into my soul by the means of faith. The thing present in this Sacrament is Christ himself spiritually; the thing absent is Christ’s body corporally.’³⁷ ‘We have no need that Christ should come from heaven to us; but that we should ascend to him, lifting up our hearts through a lively faith on high unto the right hand of the Father, where Christ sitteth, from whence we wait for our redemption; and we must not seek for Christ in these bodily elements.’³⁸

³⁷ Early Writings, pp. 191, 209.

³⁸ *Ib.* Confession of Christian Faith. Fathers of the English Church, v. 466. See also a Sermon by Bradford—‘The Supper of the Lord’—combining a clear exposure of Romish error, with a full and edifying statement of the Protestant, Scriptural truth.

Thus is the presence of Christ fully acknowledged—but spiritually—not in the bread and wine, but—as Hooker has taught—in the soul of the faithful communicant.³⁹

Dr. Waterland's judgment will admirably close this point of our discussion. 'The sum of all'—he observes—'is, that Sacramental or symbolical feeding in the Eucharist is feeding upon the body broken and blood shed under the signs and symbols of bread and wine. The result of such feeding is, the strengthening or perfecting our mystical union with the body glorified. And so, properly speaking, we feed upon the body as dead, and we receive it into closer union as living; and both in the Eucharist when duly celebrated.'⁴⁰

Such is the spiritual fellowship, in which our gracious Lord manifests his spiritual presence in the Sacrament. Naturally flowing out of this communion with the Divine Head is fellowship with his members, as united to the same body, and partakers of the same privileges. "We, being many" in this communion of the blood and body of Christ, "are one bread and one body ;

³⁹ See p. 33. Cranmer remarks on the converse to this statement as the Popish error on the Sacrament. L. iii. c. 2.

⁴⁰ 'Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist, as laid down in Scripture and Antiquity.' Works, vii. p. 192. See the distinctive points of this controversy, as maintained in the Reformers' Disputation, drawn out with singular accuracy of discrimination by our great martyrologist—a theologian of no ordinary stamp. Foxe, vi. 520—525.

for we are all partakers of that one bread.”⁴¹ Our participation in the common privilege is the proof of our union with the body, growing up out of many members, as the many grains make the one bread. Thus is this Sacrament, like the other,⁴² an uniting bond, by which we are separated from every other religion—knit together—not only in spiritual, but in visible unity—consecrated in mutual fellowship with Christ and his church. “One is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren.”⁴³ This meeting in “his banquetting house, with his banner of love over us,”⁴⁴ sheds an heavenly radiance over our Christian profession. The Sacramental graces of repentance and faith—of hungering and thirsting after Christ—of thanksgiving and brotherly love⁴⁵—are here drawn out into lively and practical exercise.

These graces we insist upon as qualifications for communion; and the profession of them is an intelligent and credible, though not always a satisfactory, profession of faith. We can warn hypocrites, but we cannot exclude them. The king’s

⁴¹ 1 Cor. x. 16, 17. Bullinger expounds the communion to describe the participants—not the privilege. ‘The Church is called this communion of the body and blood, because it is redeemed by this body and blood.’ Sermons, pp. 121–124. This seems unnatural and unsatisfactory. The obvious and most profitable exposition is, to mark the joint communion of the members with their Lord and their consequent identity with each other. Calvin and Beza in loco.

⁴² Ib. xii. 13.

⁴³ Matt. xxiii. 8.

⁴⁴ Can. ii. 4,

⁴⁵ Our Church intimates brotherly love as a secondary end of this Sacrament. Art. xxviii.

eye only can infallibly see the unwelcome guest ; and he will not fail to put him to shame.⁴⁶ Our duty is to set out the awful guilt of this profanation,⁴⁷ connected as it often is—not only with utter ignorance and hardness—but with a formal or self-righteous customary attendance, and with the neglect of the exercise of these graces, which alone can realize an acceptable or profitable improvement of the ordinance.

Generally speaking—our instruction should be directed by Philip Henry's admirable rule—so ' to manage it, that the weak may not be discouraged, and yet that the ordinance might not be profaned ; ' ⁴⁸ neither raising the standard too high for the humble, contrite, or even scrupulous ; nor lowering it to the generality of a formal profession ; using only the alluring compulsion of evangelical motive. ⁴⁹

Our instruction must obviously vary according to the character of the recipient. *To the ignorant*, the spiritual character and the solemn obligations, of the ordinance ; the hypocrisy of uniting in the deep-toned abasement and elevated exercises of our mode of administration ; and most of all, the awful condemnation of unworthy participation,

⁴⁶ Matt. xxii. 11—13.

⁴⁷ 1 Cor. xi. 27—29.

⁴⁸ Life, p. 43.

⁴⁹ Luke xiv. 23. The exclusion of the ungodly, under every form, from this ordinance, seems to be directly implied, if not commanded—Ezek. xlv. 6—9. Compare 1 Cor. x. 16—21, also Ex. xii. 43, 48.

are subjects of direct and awakening conviction. For how affecting is the consideration, that the "table" of the Lord (to accommodate the prophetic imprecation) will "become a snare before them, and that, which should have been for their welfare, will become a trap!"⁵⁰ *To those who wish to commence their attendance in this unsatisfactory state*, we should strongly recommend delay, with much self-inquiry and earnest prayer for Christian sincerity and Divine illumination. *Many persons in a state of conviction* regard this ordinance as an end—rather than as a means to an end. They put it in the place of Christ, instead of using it as a means of coming to Christ. They have a strong impulse to come to the ordinance, but without any intelligent perception of its meaning. They must be taught, that the sacrament is not life, but food to support life: food, which nourishes the living, but cannot quicken the dead. Christ—not the ordinance—is life. *Faith in him—not in the means*—will insure acceptance.¹

⁵⁰ Psalm lxi. 22.

¹ Much error on this subject has arisen from the Sacramental exposition of John vi. which, though supported by Patristic and Romish authority, receives no support from the Fathers and soundest Divines of our Church. Waterland, whom Dr. Pusey describes as having been 'in his day a pillar of the Church against heresy,' observes, 'that our Reformers in general, for *very weighty reasons*, rejected the Sacramental interpretation.' Elsewhere he remarks—'Cranmer has shown by convincing reasons drawn from the Church itself, that John vi. ought not to be interpreted of the Eucharist.' (Doctrine on the Eucharist.) Hooker's great name is adduced by his Editor (Keble's Pref. lxxxv) but inaccurately, on this side.

To the sincere, but scrupulous, we must show, that there is the sin of unbelief, as well as of presumption—sin in refusing to come, as well as in

Indeed nothing can be more sound than his statement. He adverts to our Lord's discourse, as 'setting out his own flesh and blood as the cause of eternal life'—*not by the Sacrament*—but 'through the dignity and worth of his Person, which offered them up by way of sacrifice for the life of the whole world.' *He then proceeds to speak of the Sacrament after-ward instituted, as the permanent representation of it*, and the seal and the means of receiving the blessing. (Book v. lxvii. 4.) In fact, this view is contrary to Hooker's expressed judgment. Our Lord is here speaking of *the cause or principle of life* (53); whereas Hooker distinctly gives his mind, that 'the grace which we have by the holy Eucharist, *doth not begin*, but continue life.' (Ib. lvii. 6. lxvii. 1.) Bishop Taylor contends, that the passage is *not* properly spoken of the Sacraments, and proves with Waterland, by a list of authorities, that even the Romish Writers—much as this interpretation serves their system—are not agreed upon it. (On Real Presence, p. 437. Waterland, pp. 187, 188.) Our most standard commentators (Hammond, Whitby, and others; see Dr. Bloomfield's Synopsis) take the same view. Bishop Hopkins gives what we conceive to be the true meaning of the words—'that they are *not to be understood principally* or primarily of the Sacrament, but of faith in the merit of Christ wrought out for us in his body and by the shedding of his blood.' (Works ii. 432. Compare Cranmer's Treatise on the Sacraments. Bishop Ridley's Works, p. 21. Bishop Hall's Works, ix. 443.) Indeed, as Bishop Beveridge remarks, who strongly argues on this same side (On Art. xxviii.) 'it is very unlikely that our Lord would preach concerning this Sacrament at least a year before it was instituted'—much more that he should *absolutely and universally* connect the salvation of the soul and all the high privileges of his gospel with an ordinance not then in existence. In this case all that died within this interval to the appointment of the Sacrament, and—as Bishop Beveridge remarks—'all since that have died before they have received the Sacrament, must of necessity be damned.' Infant communion was insisted upon by Augustine, as one of the necessary, but most absurd consequences of this hypothesis. Not being able to free his mind from this view, or to escape this inevitable result, he scrupled not to

coming unworthily—the guilt of disobedience to the dying command of our best and dearest friend—the neglect of the privilege of a heavenly feast, of an open confession of the cross, and of brotherly communion with the followers of Christ. The early stage of awakened tenderness and concern needs special instruction and encouragement. The weakest disciple has an equal right to this ordinance with the most established. Perfect assurance is not required; rather the want of it is supposed. The seal is given in confirmation of what was before a matter of doubt. Let *the solemnity* of the ordinance enforce preparation, and *its simplicity* encourage faith; and so let him come with humility and reverence; and who can doubt of his acceptance? ²

assert the infant's danger of damnation without the Sacrament. (De Pecc. merit. et remiss. Compare Chemnit in John vi. 53. l. i. c. 20.) Apart from this cruel and unscriptural judgment, the gross evils of this interpretation are—that it concentrates in the Sacrament all the fruits and privileges flowing from our union with Christ, and nullifies all the rich enjoyment and strength growing out of the daily “life of faith on the Son of God.”

Waterland well distinguishes between interpreting and applying, and admits with Cranmer the justice of *applying the general doctrine* of John vi. to the particular case of the worthy reception of the Eucharist, because the spiritual feeding there mentioned is the thing both signified and performed in the Eucharist. (Works vii. 111. Comp. Bullinger's Sermons, pp. 262, 270. Zepperi De Sacramentis, pp. 604—608.) Add to which—if Christ be the only food of the soul, then this Sacrament as one important means of nourishment, must be included as a part in a whole. But *the interpretation* has ever been a stronghold of Popery, formality, and self-righteousness. Comp. Scott's valuable note on vv. 52—58.

² Mr. Robinson, on one occasion in his early Ministry,

The Sacrificial character and efficacy of this Ordinance—though supported by some names of note, have in the writer's judgment no warrant from Scripture, which often calls the death of Christ a sacrifice—nowhere the memorial of his death. Indeed the contrast drawn between the one offering of Calvary, and the continual remembrance and offering of the Jewish sacrifices seems clearly to contravene this view.³ The Sacred writers of the New Testament have carefully avoided the application of sacrificial terms to the Christian Ministry. The judgment of our Reformers is beyond all question. They scrupulously expurgated the services of phrases inadvertently introduced, and which had been the cause of much corruption or misunderstanding. Their studied substitution of the table for the altar in the Sacramental service cannot be mistaken. One of their earliest movements was in accordance with this alteration. Bishop Ridley's commencement by Royal Edict, in his own diocese⁴ was soon

being surprised by the ardent and determined wish of a stranger to attend his sacrament, and having in vain recommended delay, at length asked him—'Do you cordially grieve for sin? Is your dependence simply upon Christ? Is your mind fully bent upon serving God in holiness?' The man answering satisfactorily, was desired to listen to the service, to look for Divine direction, and if his heart were still inclined, to come with assurance of welcome. Strength and consolation were given; and he went on his way rejoicing.' Life, pp. 45—47.

³ Heb. x. 2, 3, 11.

⁴ Works, pp. 321—4, 507, 8.

followed by an Injunction for the change of altars into tables throughout the kingdom—a decree which was again renewed in the Revival of the Reformation under Elizabeth. The name of Priest is indeed ordinarily retained; yet this evidently in reference to its etymological derivation (*Presbyter*) carefully telling her members in speaking of the Lord's Supper—"Herein *thou needest no other sacrifice or oblation—no sacrificing Priest.*"⁵ Hooker—admitting in answer to his objector '*that Sacrifice is now no part of the Church Ministry,*' rightly determines, that 'in truth the word *Presbyter* doth seem more fit, and in propriety of speech more agreeable than *Priest* with the drift of the whole Gospel of Jesus Christ.'⁶ Archbishop Whitgift quells his apprehensions from the continued use of the term, that 'as heretofore use hath made it to be taken *for a sacrifice*, so will use now alter that signification, and make it to be taken *for a Minister of the Gospel.*'⁷ None of these sound men ever admitted into their Protestant judgments the Tractarian dogma of 'an offering—though commemorative, *for quick and dead for*

⁵ Homily on Sacrament, Part i.

⁶ Book v. lxxviii. 2, 3.

⁷ Defence against Cartwright, p. 722. 'It appeareth that the sacrificing Priesthood is changed by God's ordinance into a preaching Priesthood; and the sacrificing Priesthood should cease utterly, saving inasmuch as all Christian men are sacrificing Priests.' Bishop Latimer's Disputation at Oxford. Foxe vi. 502.

the remission of sin.'⁸ The language of our Church is simple, and in clear accordance with the original command—'*a perpetual memory of that his most precious death.*'⁹ It is this memorial and representation of the sacrifice, that constitutes its profitable use, as a means in the exercise of faith of receiving its inestimable blessings. We commemorate (as Waterland justly observes) the grand sacrifice, but do not reiterate it—*no, not so much as under symbols.*'¹⁰ 'The whole substance of our Sacrifice, which is frequented of the Church in the Lord's Supper, consisteth in prayer, praise, and in giving of thanks, and in remembering and showing forth of that Sacrifice offered upon the altar of the cross.'¹¹ Any other view is a retrograde movement to the bondage of Judaism.

⁸ Tract 90, p. 63. 'Though commemorative'—was added after the first edition. The whole view is elaborated at full length in Tract 81. See Mr. Goode's most valuable refutation and exposition of the whole Doctrine. Rule of Faith and Practice ii. 135—190. Dr. Pusey seems to place the mass much upon a level with this holy ordinance. He speaks of the people as 'mostly gazing at the threshold of the heaven, where they do not enter.' (Sermon on Sacrament, p. 28 and note.) This might have appeared extraordinary from one who had subscribed Art. xxxi., did we not remember the Salvo for Subscription in Tract 90—approved and recommended by Dr. Pusey.

⁹ 1 Cor. xi. 25, 26, with Exhortation Communion Service.

¹⁰ Works, vii. 378.

¹¹ Bishop Ridley ut supra. p. 24. 'That in the sacred Supper there is a sacrifice in that sense wherein the Fathers spok, enone of us ever doubted. But that is *Eucharistical*—as Augustine interprets it—a memorial of Christ's passion, celebrated in the Church. And from the sweet commemoration of our redemption, there arises another sacrifice—the sa-

It is important also to view this sacrament in conformity with the true spirit of the dispensation—as Augustine well reminds us—to ‘venerate these ordinances, not with carnal bondage, but with spiritual liberty.’¹² To invest the holy table, as some appear to do, with a cloud of awful mystery, is as if we were living under “the covenant that gendereth unto bondage.”¹³ Whereas we are not come to the dark gloom of the Mount that burned with fire, affrighting the heart even of the holy mediator. We are come to the Mount of light and love—to the joy of communion with our God. Instead of being debarred—as of old—from a near approach, we “have boldness to enter into the holiest.”¹⁴ Deeply let us cherish the godly reverence in his service. “For even our God is a consuming fire.”¹⁵ But never let us forget that the holy ordinance is a means of refreshment to a rejoicing heart. And if under the dispensation of shadows, much more we, under the sunshine of the joyous gospel, should “go unto the altar of God, unto God *our*

crifice of praise, and from thence a true peace-offering of the Christian soul. But for any propitiatory sacrifice, unless it be representatively, *I find none.*’ Bishop Hall’s No Peace with Rome. Works xi. 360, 362. Compare Heb. xiii. 15, 16. Bingham shows that every part of Divine worship—not only the service of the altar—had the name of sacrifice, in the ancient Church. Book xiii. c. i. 5. 5.

¹² De Doctr. Christian. c. iii. 9. ¹³ Gal. iv. 24—26.

¹⁴ Heb. xii. 18—24, with x. 19, 20.

¹⁵ Ib. xii. 28, 29. καὶ γὰρ. The distinctive emphasis of καὶ is overlooked by our Translators.

exceeding joy."¹⁶ To cloud our sunshine is to cramp our privilege, and to palsy our strength.

Yet this is the character of the Patristic system now obtruded upon the Church. Chrysostom marvels, that the Apostle should 'give the title of "*cup of blessing*" to that fearful and most tremendous cup.'¹⁷ We, on the other hand, marvel, that the good father should have bestowed so grossly unsuitable a title upon so rich and cheering a blessing. Yet it seems, that while we must 'draw men with fervency and love,' we must 'wake ourselves, and *be filled with horror*'¹⁸—an incongruous combination, every way unbefitting the worship of a God of grace and love—a terrific entrance to the ineffable glory, which his glowing imagination opens before us. How different this from the simple history of the first converts, who, in reverential joy, not in servile terror, honoured their God in this holy ordinance!¹⁹ How different, we might say, is this ideal atmosphere of fervour, to the dignity, simplicity, and genuine glow of our Sacramental service! This is not faith, but fancy—not reverence, but superstition—the will-worship of a slave, not the evangelical freedom of a child. Assuredly, this is not the way to restore the holy Sacrament to its high dignity among Christian ordinances.

¹⁶ Pa. xliii. 4.

¹⁷ On 1 Cor. x. 16.

¹⁸ Ib. on verses 23, 24. Comp. on xiv. 33. Eph. i. 23.

¹⁹ Acts ii. 46, 47.

The Tractarian system, with perhaps less of terrific gloom, is constructed upon the same ground-work, yet with principles apparently opposite, the connection of which at least is very doubtful. At one time we are described as chained down with the weight, and fainting under the guilt, of post-baptismal sin—that darkening cloud of man's counsel over the radiancy of "the Sun of Righteousness." There seems no other pathway to heaven than endurance and sorrow. It is as if we must wear our prison garments to the end, and work in chains under the mournful and hopeless sense of delinquency.²⁰ And yet—*not by the cleansing blood* of Christ on the conscience²¹ (of which we hear nothing), but by the virtue of this ordinance—the soul is "caught up to the third heaven," in such extravagance of sensation, that we might almost conceive ourselves to be in contact with the wildest atmosphere of Methodism.²² We should be glad to elevate our standard of expectation and enjoyment. But it must be chastised spirituality and sober scriptural warrant. This ecstatic privilege is however

²⁰ Dr. Pusey on Baptism, Tract 68. Sewell's Christian Morals, p. 408. We thankfully refer to the masterly Refutation of this deadly error in the Bishop of Ossory's Charge.

²¹ Heb. ix. 14. 1 John i. 7.

²² Dr. Pusey's Sermon on the Sacrament, pp. 15, 18. It is right however to observe that he confesses the omission of the pardoning grace of the holy Eucharist 'to have made his post-baptismal statement imperfect.' Letter to Abp. of Canterbury, p. 92.

the portion only of a favoured few. Dr. Pusey entitles his sermon—‘The Holy Eucharist a comfort to the Penitent.’ The penitent opens the sermon with lively emotion. But alas! he finds that he has no present interest in it. The privilege belongs to ‘the holy;’ and he ‘by a holier discipline of the Church would for a time be removed from it.’²³ But would the Saviour have excluded him from ‘this deepest river of his joy?’ For whom was the ordinance instituted? Who were the first communicants? Did they rise above the level of penitents? Were they not weak—every way imperfect—far removed from the lofty but ideal elevation of ‘the holy?’ In what character but that of a penitent should we desire to come? Who else would have any sympathy with our Sacramental confession? At what advanced stage of attainment may we deem ourselves to have passed the boundary of penitence into the region of ‘the holy?’ Who these latter are, or where they are to be found, save in Dr. Pusey’s system, we cannot determine. But the distinction, we doubt not, is utterly inconsistent with the character and freeness of the Gospel. ‘The holy’ is always a penitent to the end; while the penitent at his first entrance into the church, confirms his title equally with ‘the holy’ to the full privileges of salvation.²⁴ This is the only Gospel that deserves the name.

²³ Ib. pp. 2, 3, 18.

²⁴ See the message to *little children* 1 John ii. 12.—*all that believe are justified.* Acts xiii. 39. Rom. iii. 22, 23.

Most painful is the reflection, that this precious ordinance should be so stripped of its real and spiritual efficacy by the corruptions of man's wisdom. Rich indeed are its privileges—strengthening its virtue, when it is honoured in the simplicity of faith, and the contrition of a heart under Divine influence and heavenly teaching.

CHAP. VII.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS.

It will have been sufficiently obvious, that, while we have endeavoured to take a comprehensive view of the Sacramental subject, we have had a primary reference to certain prevalent errors more or less pervading the Church.

I. We add a few words further *upon the danger of unduly exalting these Divine ordinances*. We feel deeply the weight of the Bishop of Calcutta's judgment, that 'over-statements with regard to them destroy their nature, and mar the simplicity of the Gospel.'²⁵ This is no contest of words, no 'Adiaphoritic controversy,'²⁶ but one 'involving' (in the words of one of the Foreign Reformers) 'a deep obscuration of Christ and corruption of the faith. 'For some'—adds the writer—'have attributed so much to a *carnal eating of Christ* in the Sacraments, as to make a simple faith in Christ

²⁵ Charge, p. 47.

²⁶ Scott's Contin. of Milner's Hist. of Church, ii. 48, 112.

crucified not sufficient to give peace to the soul, which is contrary to the words of Christ, and derogatory to the power of faith.’²⁷ The same deadly error in a more refined form is brought out under the cover of a *spiritual eating* of Christ in the Sacrament—a subtle principle of Popery, that true religion of the human heart, which, we fear, is worming its way into the very vitals of the Church. We cannot forget, how Rome has owed her direful Ecclesiastical Sovereignty to mysterious and delusive exaggerations of the Sacraments. And we are therefore quite prepared to recognize the same ideal and unscriptural dominance, as a corporate part of a system, whose *tendency ad Latium* is more and more fully developed.

But so far as true spirituality and Christian holiness are concerned, we are persuaded that “their root shall bear rottenness, and their blossom shall go up as the dust.”²⁸ To ‘work upward’ from the Sacraments (to use the illustration of a powerful writer) is ‘to commence our labours at the wrong end.’²⁹ To make men spiritual after Hooker’s mode³⁰—by setting Christ before them in the preaching of the Gospel, as the One source of life—this will bring rich fruitfulness to the Church. To men thus spiritualized, spiritual ordinances will be “wells of salvation, from which they will draw

²⁷ Letter of Oecolampadius, the Swiss Reformer, Scott’s continuation of Milner, iii. 167.

²⁸ Isa. v. 24.

²⁹ Ancient Christianity, i. 269, 270.

³⁰ See Discourse on Justification, quoted p. 53 n.

water with joy.”³¹ Sacraments will then be practically operative. The initial ordinance of which we were the unconscious subjects, will bind its constraining influence upon us; opening to us the manifestation of our gracious God, and consecrating us to his service in our personal acknowledgment of the covenant, in which we were engaged to him. The commemorative ordinance—received as it now will be in a vivid apprehension of the great doctrines which it exhibits—will be a real communion with the Lord, ‘strengthening and refreshing to the soul.’³² Thus Sacramental reverence will be cherished without superstition, and with its attendant graces of holiness, joy, humility, and love. This was the mode of the first wise master-builders of the Church. They first preached the Gospel—then they administered the Sacraments—‘joining baptism’—as Calvin observes—‘to the holy band of doctrine,’ Thus they built up the church upon the grand “foundations of” Christian doctrine, “Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone.”³³ The attempt therefore now making to raise our Church upon Sacramental foundation, traduces her real character and Scriptural ground, by exhibiting a frame-work of administration, most dissimilar to the Divine and Apostolical model.

³¹ Isa. xii. 3.

³² Catechism.

³³ Acts ii. 36—41; viii. 5—12, 35, 38; xvi. 14, 15, 31—33. Calvin on Matt. xxviii. 19. Comp. Eph. ii. 20.

II. *Much confusion has been brought into the argument by a want of accuracy, completeness, and precision of statement.* From want of accuracy the real point of the controversy is often lost in a waste of words. To deny that regeneration *always*, is considered tantamount with the denial that it *ever*, attends the ordinance of Baptism ; and strong argument, based on scripture, is devoted, either to prove what is admitted on both sides, or to disprove what had never been conceived. To demur to the efficiency of the external administration, is often supposed to depreciate either the nature or the grace of the Sacrament. Dr. Pusey seems to assume—though most erroneously—all his opponents to be of the Zuinglian School.³⁴ He insinuates from our rejection of some of the Sacramental interpretations of antiquity, ‘our lessened esteem for our Saviour’s gift, and consequently our diminished, or, at all events, less humble, affectionateness for the Giver.’ He charges us, ‘in the fear of a papal magnifying of the Sacrament, with having fallen into the opposite extreme—that for fear it should seem *absolutely necessary*, we have made it seem *almost indifferent*’—and for fear God’s grace should be ‘tied to the Sacrament, we virtually disjoin God’s

³⁴ Just as the *British Critic*, with equal candour, assumes all who do not belong to their school, to be Latitudinarian or Puritan, and cannot conceive of any other alternative. See Article explanatory of Unprotestantizing.—July 1842.

grace from his own ordinance.' As for himself and his friends, *they* have 'adhered strictly to the letter of scripture—*they* have taken God's promises and declarations simply as they found them.' And in 'contrasting with this mode of exposition that adopted by such *as fear unduly to exalt the Sacraments, and do in fact abuse them to signs only*'—he asks, with evident satisfaction—'Which seems the most faithful exposition of God's word?' He adds a solemn warning 'against a most perilous path—the high road to Socinianism—when the plain letter of Scripture says, we are saved by baptism, and men say, we are *not* saved by Baptism—when Scripture saith, that "they have been buried with Christ by Baptism unto death," and men saith, that they have *not*,' &c.³⁵

Now these are words of solemn pomp—not of sober truth. They put forth grave charges with great self-complacency, but with most culpable want of accuracy and candour. We might rebut the charge at once—as Hooker did a similar one, from alas! not a very opposite quarter—'They pretend'—saith he, speaking of the Romanists—'that to Sacraments we ascribe no efficacy, but make them'—(as Dr. Pusey charges us) '*bare signs* of instruction and admonition, *which is utterly false*. For Sacraments with us are signs effectual. They are the instruments of God, whereby to be-

³⁵ Tracts on Baptism, pp. 34, 132, 197, 198.

stow grace; howbeit grace, not proceeding from the visible signs, but from his invisible power.’³⁶ We thankfully acknowledge the rich flow of Sacramental blessing; but we connect it as Hooker and our Reformers do,³⁷ *with the whole ordinance*—not with the outward ceremony. We believe that Baptism, as a whole Sacrament, combining both parts—the sign and the grace—does convey regeneration. But we protest against taking a part for the whole. We contend that the mere form—as it too often is—is not the ordinance, and does not convey the blessing; so that while we accredit the commission, we deny the efficiency. We receive the Scripture as literally as Dr. Pusey does. We say not—as he intimates—that ‘Baptism does *not* save us, when the Scripture saith *it does*.’ But we say, that the *outward* baptism does not save us. *The Baptism of form*—as the Apostle justly discriminates—“the putting away of the filth of the flesh,”—is null and void. *The Baptism of faith*—“the answer of a good conscience toward God”—is valid, yet not in itself, but “by the resurrection of Jesus Christ”³⁸—‘It is’—as Bishop Burnet admirably observes—‘a very natural distinction, to say, that the outward effects of Baptism follow it as outwardly performed; but that

³⁶ Book v. App. i. Works, ii. 703. Compare Bullinger’s Sermons, pp. 97—99.

³⁷ See quotations from Cranmer, p. 28 n. Ecc. Pol. V. lviii. 2.

³⁸ 1 Peter iii. 21.

the inward effects follow upon the inward acts.’³⁹ The ordinance, therefore, in the external ministration merely is incomplete, and hence cannot be spiritually effective. The true end has not been fulfilled, when the outward sign only (which we have proved to be separable from the inward grace⁴⁰) has been received. ‘Because of our infirmity’—as Calvin excellently reminds us—‘it is for our behoof to begin at the water. But we must not tarry at it. For the sign that is offered unto our eyes serveth to lead us to the Holy Ghost; to the end that we may know how that it is from him that the power of Baptism proceedeth.’⁴¹

But we have to regret—not only a want of accuracy—but *an incompleteness* of statement—a mass of what is popularly called ‘one-sided statement’—that greatly hinders a clear and satisfactory conclusion. Let us be careful, that in bringing out our catena of authorities, we give *the whole* mind and judgment of the writers. Thus when Cranmer testifies, that ‘Christ hath ordained one visible Sacrament of spiritual Regeneration in water,’ we must in all fairness combine what here and elsewhere he writes upon the efficacy of baptismal water, with his other statement—‘All that be baptized in the water, *be not washed* with the

³⁹ On Art. xxvii.

⁴⁰ Chap. iii.

⁴¹ Sermons on the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, 1579, p. 1226. ‘The Spirit alone,’—says Cyprian,—‘imparts the reality of the Sacrament to us.’ Quoted by Bishop Davenant, on Col. ii. 11.

Holy Ghost.’⁴² Bishop Latimer speaks also of ‘remission of sins by baptism—finding Christ in baptism.’ Yet elsewhere he writes, *not contravening, but balancing and completing*, his statement—‘These must have a regeneration; and what is this regeneration? *It is not to be christened with water, and nothing else.* How is it to be expounded then? Saith St. Peter—“We be born again.” How? Not by a mortal seed, but by an immortal. What is this immortal seed? *By the word of the living God*—by the word of God, preached and opened. *Thus cometh our regeneration.*’⁴³ Bishop Jewel scruples not to write of the ordinance of Baptism—‘It is our regeneration or new birth, whereby we are born anew in Christ, and are made the sons of God, and the heirs of the kingdom of heaven.’ Yet of the same Sacrament he writes again—‘In Baptism, as the one part of that holy mystery is the blood of Christ, so is the other the natural water. Neither are these parts joined together in place, but in mystery; *and therefore they be often severed, and the one is received without the other.*’⁴⁴

To give a complete view of the mind of our Reformers, we must—as we have before hinted⁴⁵—connect their high sacramental views with the

⁴² Cranmer’s Remains, ii. 302, with 439; iii. 323.

⁴³ Sermons ii. 779 with i. 72.

⁴⁴ On the Sacraments, p. 265, with Reply to Harding, p. 285.

⁴⁵ Pp. 27, 28.

supposition of a right reception of the ordinance—a connection so often stated, that, even where it was omitted, it may be considered as implied. Thus Bishop Jewel again and again speaks to this purport—‘If any man have this outward seal, *and have not the faith thereof sealed within his heart, it availeth him not.* He is but an hypocrite and dissembler.’ Almost immediately after, he writes of ‘*the water that regenerateth him that believeth.*’⁴⁶ We have often regretted the want of this important connection in many modern statements of authority. We do not object to what is said, but to what is left unsaid. We feel deeply that the exhibition of baptismal privilege, without a commensurate inculcation of worthy reciprocity, is productive of formality and delusion—not of Christian holiness. In fact this constitutes the vital difference between us and the Romanists: must we not add—between us and Romish Protestants? They connect the blessing with a right administration—we with a right reception—of the ordinance.⁴⁷ They extend the

⁴⁶ On the Sacraments, pp. 262, 263, ut supra—‘Jewel, the worthiest Divine that Christendom hath had for the space of some hundred years.’ Such was Hooker’s testimony (Book ii. vi. 4.) of a man, whose works—the Apology especially—commanded universal reverence, and were held in our Church as almost of equal authority with our Articles. See also Burnet’s fine testimony to him.—Pref. to Expos. of Articles. Let the Reader compare, if he will, the flippant sarcasms of Mr. Froude and the *British Critic*, and judge on which side the solid weight of authority is found.

⁴⁷ Bishop Mant’s Tracts place the whole ground of Baptismal

blessing wherever the commission is accredited. We restrict it under an accredited commission to where the ordinance is honoured. With them therefore the grace under a legitimate ministry is universal. With us it is discriminating. We deny not the extent of the privilege, only its promiscuous application.

There is also a great want of precision in adducing Scripture testimony on this argument. How many grave theological errors have arisen from pressing Scripture terms beside and beyond their proper use and application! Much false reasoning and unsatisfactory conclusion from this cause obscure the present point at issue. When the full baptismal privileges are claimed indiscriminately and without reserve for unconscious infants, the different character of the persons, whom the Apostle invests with these high prerogatives, seems to be put out of sight. They were intelligent⁴⁸ and gifted⁴⁹ members of the Church, who had maintained a credible profession of some standing.⁵⁰ The recent date of the several churches forbids the supposition, that they had been baptized in infancy. They must have been the adult believers, according to the records of the Acts, baptized upon the profession of their faith.

blessing upon the legitimate administration. No reference is traceable throughout the whole statement to the necessity of a right reception. The statements of most other standard writers on the same side are more discriminating. See note, p. 35.

⁴⁹ 1 Cor. xii. 7—13.

⁴⁸ Rom. vi. 3, 4, with vii. 1.

⁵⁰ Gal. iii. 27, with 1—3.

Not but that infants, even in the first ages of the Church, were fully interested in their Baptismal inheritance. We must otherwise suppose them either to have been circumcised, and so brought again under the Judaical yoke; or,—what is no less improbable,—that they were, without any moral ground, excommunicated from the covenant of grace, into which they had been formerly admitted—their privileges under the Gospel being thus made in one most important point less than they had been under the law. As it is but “one Baptism,”¹ we cannot suppose it to be different to the adult and to the infant, where the need, the capacity,² and the interest, is virtually the same. Yet the two cases must be brought to some identity or parallelism, in order that what is clearly predicated of the one, may be scripturally applied to the other. The adult was evidently invested (as we have seen) with baptismal privilege *upon his sincere profession of repentance and faith*,³ and so far only as it was sincere, can we conceive of any attendant blessing. Upon the same ground only can we suppose the infant investiture—not when the ordinance has been a profane mockery or an empty form; but when it has been a true Sacramental covenanting and dedication to God. The promiscuous indiscriminate appropriation of privilege to *every* baptized child, presents no relative parallelism to the Scriptural application, and

¹ Eph. iv. 5.² See pp. 11, 68.³ See pp. 12,—14.

therefore cannot fairly be admitted a satisfactory demonstration. We do not therefore—as Dr. Pusey insinuates—boldly contradict the Scripture, by denying the privilege of the baptism into death.⁴ We only investigate the precise application of the term, and *within the limits of the application when discovered*, we predicate as decidedly as himself.

We observe the same want of precise accuracy in the use made of our Primary Church authorities. We have already adverted to our Baptismal Services as pressed beyond measure, and with very doubtful application in this argument.⁵ How often do we hear of Hooker's high estimate of Sacramental grace, while his own express limitation, which in fact furnishes the key to his whole statement, is left unnoticed! When he speaks of 'Baptism as a seal perhaps to the grace of election'⁶ (a sentence expressed indeed with modest

⁴ Tracts on Baptism, p. 198.

⁵ Chap. v. pp. 81, 82.

⁶ B. v. lx. 3. This, as might naturally be expected, was Calvin's judgment. Instit. iv. c. xvi. 21, 22. Bucer also evidently inclines to it. De Vi. et Effic. Baptismi Scripta Anglicana, p. 597. 'Sacramenta in solis electis efficiunt quod figurant'—is quoted rather loosely from Augustine. Burgess's 'Baptismal Regeneration of Elect Infants,' pp. 133, 134. Dr. Pusey however doubts the accuracy of the quotation—not being able to discover it, and judging it to be inconsistent with his other statements. Tracts, p. 292. Yet if baptism be the seal of the covenant of grace—(Rom. iv. 11.) its spiritual efficacy would obviously be confined to the limits of this covenant—whatever these limits may be. Witsius—who of course argues on the restricted application—has some interesting and profitable discussion. De Effic. Bapt. in Infant. vi.—xiv. Compare Ussher's Body of Divinity, p. 501.

hesitation, but obviously giving his preponderating judgment) he clearly intends his exhibition of privilege to be limited to the sphere of God's election—that is—of the spiritual Church of God. His known and declared judgment of 'the Perpetuity of Faith in God's elect' is sufficient confirmation of this view. A mind of his profound and accurate thinking could never have included in his system dogmas so manifestly inconsistent with each other—as those of universal regeneration (necessarily involving the *Defectibility* of grace) and the *Perpetuity* of the Divine principle. Evidently therefore the universal grace of Baptism derives no warranted support from this revered name.⁷

III. *We would notice the vast moment of a well-balanced view of Sacramental grace.* We have a need to guard alike against superstition and irreverence. Can we forget—as a *wholesome warning against the former*—that the recipients of typical Sacraments, administered by the hands

⁷ We regret to remark a similar incorrect application of Calvin's views. He had observed—'We never have naked and mystic symbols, *except* when our ingratitude and perverseness impede the working of Divine benevolence.' Upon this Dr. Pusey insists that infants—not thus impeding the Divine operation of God through his Sacrament—*according to Calvin's own principles*, they must participate of its grace.' Calvin however had given just before this express limitation to his words—*Suo more Paulus—quia ad fideles est sermo*'—&c. plainly speaking of the cases of adult believers. The application to infants was not in his mind, and therefore ought not to have been argued upon. Calv. on Rom. vi. 3, 4, with Tracts on Baptism, p. 84 n.

of God himself, perished?⁸ It is therefore a well-timed admonition of Bishop Davenant—‘ We must not glory, because we are made partakers of the external Sacrament, unless we obtain besides, the internal and quickening work of Christ. For if this be wanting, as it was heretofore said to the Jews, (Acts vii. 51) *O ye uncircumcised in heart*—so it may be justly said to us—*O ye unbaptized in heart.*’⁹ *As a restraint against the latter*, we hear the solemn declaration of our holy God sealed with so fearful a sentence—“ I will be sanctified in all them that draw nigh to me.”¹⁰—“ God greatly to be feared in the assembly of the saints, and to be had in reverence of all them that are about him.”¹¹ We greatly admire the manifold wisdom exemplified in the Sacramental œconomy. Lest in a pretension to a spurious spirituality we should slight the ordinances as empty forms, he has appointed them to be *effectual means of grace*. Lest we should depend upon them in a self-righteous formality, he has ordained them as *only means*. The practical apprehension of this precise medium will preserve us from the errors on the right hand and on the left. We subtract nothing from their Scriptural efficacy. We attribute to them nothing beyond the plain declaration of Scripture.

We admit indeed the extreme difficulty of main-

⁸ 1 Cor. x. 1—5.

¹⁰ Lev. x. 1—3.

⁹ On Col. ii. 11.

¹¹ Psalm lxxxix. 7.

taining this true mean between the undue exaltation and depreciation of the Sacraments. The movement of a great controversy *without a careful self-discipline* shakes the right balance, and turns it aside from the straight line; so that error is too often opposed—not by sound and well-considered truth, but by the opposite extreme—or at least by some tendency towards it.¹² The circumstances of the times often constrain us to view truth rather in its opposition to error, than in its own native freedom, simplicity, and purity. This brings us almost necessarily under an influence unfavourable to a calm and dispassionate investigation. For, constituted as we are—with so much corruption and perversity yet adhering to us—a strong revulsion against particular errors may sometimes hinder a clear apprehension of important truth. In contending earnestly against the Romish error (alas ! not confined to Rome) of the Sacraments conferring grace *ex opere operato*,¹³ *non ex opere operantis*, we may in the heat of the controversy (as we think the Foreign Reformers did) overlook *their instrumental efficacy* as a Divinely-appointed means. Bishop Hooper's strong Protestant revolting might, in his controversy with Gardiner, somewhat obscure the full apprehension of the truth,

¹² Incidit in Scyllan, qui vult vitare Charybdim.

¹³ i. e. as Bellarmine defines it—'Vi ipsius actionis Sacramentalis a Deo ad hoc institutæ, non ex merito agentis, vel susipientis.'

which shines more clearly in the simple 'Confession of his Christian Faith.'¹⁴ Calvin, when occupied in constructing his system, was fettered by human moulding, the fitting and consistency of the several parts—defending himself on all sides from assault. But as an expositor of scripture he is in a far better spirit than as a mere dogmatist.¹⁵ His views of Sacramental truth are more full. And in his free intercourse with his friends he grasps the whole compass with the liveliest interest, expressing to his dear friend Melancthon his entire agreement with Luther, that 'the Sacraments are not empty figures, but that in them is given what they exhibit—that in Baptism the power of the Spirit is present to cleanse and regenerate; that the holy Supper is a spiritual feast, in which we feed truly on the flesh and blood of Christ.'¹⁶ Zuingli also in the field of Sacramental disputation, how chilled and cramped are his statements of truth! But when exercising himself in the field of Scripture, he breathes a pure atmosphere, and brings out more enlarged and spiritual exhibition of truth.¹⁷ We are not insensible to the importance of "contending earnestly for the faith." But our souls feed on the simplicity—not the controversy of the truth.

¹⁴ See pp. 19, 20 n.

¹⁵ Comp. on Rom. vi. 3, 4. Gal. iii. 27. Eph. v. 26.

¹⁶ Opp. xiii. p. 134.

¹⁷ See e. g. his Expositions of Jer. xxvii.

Yet we should not forget, that a strong and sensitive perception of error is a most valuable preservative. Indeed the only safe holding of forms is found in maintaining a deep and primary regard to spiritual worship ;¹⁸ else will they be the paralysis—not the channel—of the divine life. ‘ Learn ’ —says the admirable Leighton—‘ to look on the ordinances of God suitably to their nature, spiritually. We would willingly have all religion reduced to externals ; and we would pay all in this coin, as cheaper and easier by far ; and would compound for the spiritual part, rather to add and give more external performance to the ceremony.’¹⁹

In fine, we know not how to balance this delicate subject better than in the careful words of this most spiritual expositor—‘ Sacraments are in the hands of the Spirit of God, as the word itself is, to convey grace and salvation to the soul by the reference they have to, and union with, that which they represent. Signs they are, but more than signs, merely representing : they are means exhibiting, and seals confirming, grace to the faithful. But the working of faith, and the conveying of Christ into the soul, to be received by faith, is not a thing put into them to do of themselves, but still in the supreme hand that appointed them ; and he indeed both causes the souls of his own to receive those his seals with faith, and

¹⁸ John iv. 23, 24.

¹⁹ On 1 Peter iii. 21.

makes them effectual to confirm that faith which receives them so. They are then, in a word, neither empty signs to those that believe, nor effectual causes of grace to them that believe not.' ²⁰

IV. We remark *on the importance of a devotional exhibition and improvement of these holy ordinances*. And here we cannot but feel the great moment of a deep and prayerful study of the Scriptures; both to know the mind of God, and to breathe his spirit. Better to begin with the Bible than with the Church—to try the Church by the Bible, not the Bible by the Church. Far better also to study the subject in the Bible than in controversy. Our foundation-principles are more established. The sound mind is more perfectly balanced. We are not unmindful of the enlargement and settlement, which a well-disciplined mind will obtain in the thorny field. But principles must first be solidly grounded upon

²⁰ Ib. The same balance is struck in the terse—though somewhat quaint—language of a valuable old writer—‘We are not to conceive of the sacramental elements as bare and naked signs, so to grow into the contempt of them; neither as idol signs, by insisting on them, as if they were the whole Sacrament; for they are but outward, whereas the principal matter of a Sacrament is spiritual and inward. Thus we truest conceive of a Sacrament, when by looking at the one of these we see both; neither making the sign a vain symbol, nor yet ascribing any thing to it transcending the nature of it, such as are the peculiar and prerogatives of God; but in the sign and action, which is outward, led to those which are spiritual and inward.’ Taylor on Titus iii. 5.

Scriptural foundation, else instead of the "good thing of the heart established with grace," it will be the profession of one "carried about by every wind of doctrine—ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth."²¹ Connected with this firm Christian establishment will be a devotional spirit. We naturally inhale the atmosphere in which we live. Here we shall be walking with God. How refreshing will his ordinances then be—with a spiritual apprehension of their nature, and a spiritual taste for their enjoyment! 'As compared with those who are living in unspiritual disputation, it will be,'—as Hooker exquisitely draws the contrast,—'the one, because they enjoyed not, disputed; the other disputed not, because they enjoyed.'²² Who does not long to breathe the spirit of this truly 'seraphic doctor,' who in the adoring contemplation of these holy privileges, could command 'disputes and questions, enemies to piety, and abatements of true devotion, to take their rest;' and who summed up his triumphant exercise in this sublime aspiration—'O my God! thou art true! O my soul! thou art happy!'²³

V. *We are led to observe the primary weight of the Ministerial Office.* This gives validity to the Sacramental dispensation. Under John's

²¹ Heb. xiii. 9. 2 Tim. iii. 7.

²² Book v. lxvii. 3.

²³ Ib. lxvii. 12.

short-lived economy, Baptism was combined with preaching.²⁴ The same connection was established in the permanent establishment of the sacred function. The Baptismal commission was not only linked with teaching, but limited to those among his disciples, whom he had before separated for the express office of teaching.²⁵ To the other ordinance, as standing upon the same ground of authority, the same principles must obviously be applied; so that—as Calvin justly observes—‘since the Sacraments are annexed as appendages to the mysteries of Christ, it follows, that the Ministers of the word are the legitimate dispensers of them.’²⁶ Nor do the extreme cases, which our great Hooker feels himself constrained to admit²⁷ (with others of like emergency that might be added) in any degree invalidate the Ministerial authority, or licence a departure from Divine order in a self-constituted administration.²⁸ What God will admit in absolute necessity, or even condescend to use according to his Sovereign will, is one thing; what he has appointed as the general

²⁴ Matt. iii. 1—6.

²⁵ Ib. xxviii. 16—20.

²⁶ On 1 Cor. iv. 1. See Bp. Ridley's *Injunctions*, Works, p. 321.

²⁷ B. V. lxi. 3. lxii. 3, 13, 17, 22.

²⁸ ‘Why did Christ make choice of twelve apostles chiefly for this work, were it not his will to have some particularly to dispense the gospel? And if Christ did then separate some for that work, what reason is there to say, that office should be thus common now, which Christ himself enclosed by his own appointment?’ Bishop Stillingfleet's *Irenicum*. Part ii. c. ii. p. 25.

rule of his Church, is another. The rule—not the exception—is our standard.

We are not *always* called to condemn others, but to assure ourselves. Other communities, differing Ministrations, doing our Lord's work conscientiously, consistently, *and not with self-willed assumption*—we leave “to their own Master to stand or fall.” “How shall we curse whom God hath not cursed”²⁹—nay—where he hath manifestly blessed? When we see them—like ourselves—“casting out devils through his name;” though we cannot accredit their commission, we would not deny their work. Had we the power to forbid, should not we hear our Master's voice—“Forbid them not?”³⁰ If he accepts their labour, and forbears with their schism, what are we that we should run beyond his judgment? Shall we not rather take up the language of one of old—“O my Lord, send, I pray thee, by the hand of him whom thou wilt send?”³¹

Yet we must not undervalue the order, even admitting that the essence of the Church may be preserved without it. We are far from merging our own distinctness of authority in the loose generality of professedly Christian teaching. We are bound to “magnify our office” in the thank-

²⁹ Num. xxiii. 8.

³⁰ Mark ix. 38—40. Comp. Phil. i. 15—18. The Author's ‘Christian Ministry,’ pp. 463, 464. Sixth Edition. Comp. Hooker v. lxviii. 6.

³¹ Ex. iv. 13.

ful acknowledgment of a Divinely-delegated commission, received through a Divinely-constituted order. We gather this conviction satisfactorily to our own minds from the identity of our Church principles with those naturally inferred from the Ministerial Epistles, and from the comparison of our Episcopal constitution with the Christian Church from the Apostolic down to the Reformation era. And we deem the intelligent apprehension of this conviction to be important—not to cherish a proud and selfish bigotry, but to give assurance to our Sacramental administration; and to humble us under the deep weight of our responsibility, connected as it ever must be with a consciousness of our unworthiness and countless shortcomings.³²

³² This we conceive to be a correct statement, so far as applies to the immediate point of discussion; but very incomplete, as an exposition of the whole subject. There is ordinarily a Scriptural as well as an unscriptural—a Protestant as well as a Romish sense—in most of the terms current in our popular Theology; and perhaps it is far better accurately to define and expound the terms, than to throw them from us on account of their misstatement or corruption. E. G. Apostolical Succession (like its kindred term Baptismal Regeneration) *rightly understood*, involves a true and important doctrine. With Romanists, and with Romish Protestants, it means only the succession of the order; upon which, as if it were the foundation of the Church, the whole weight is laid. Our Reformers more soundly insisted upon a *two-fold Succession*—of order and of doctrine—the external and the spiritual line. That a succession combining both these points, was intended by the Divine Head of the Church, is manifest from the terms and extent of the promise (Matt. xxviii. 20). The inspired

VI. *We would advert, lastly, to the primary importance of a full and faithful preaching of the Gospel.* This, as Calvin most truly states in his letter to Cranmer, 'is the soul and vigour of the sacred office.'³³ We could not affix our imprimatur to *every* statement of the German Reformer. But whatever be the mixture of human infirmity, who can forbear to admire what Seckendorf tersely calls 'the heroic energy of language and argu-

testimony conducts this succession through four continuous stages without any intimation of a stop in the descent. (2 Tim. ii. 2.) Viewing it therefore as the perpetual ordinance of the Church, we cannot conceive of a defect or break in *either part* without injury to its efficient operation. The man of form takes the external. The man of loose and undisciplined views takes the spiritual part—each as the whole. The man of solid maturity—of sound practical wisdom—will connect them both—will value them both; feeling, that if the Church is grounded *upon doctrine*, (Eph. ii. 20. 1 Tim. iii. 15, 16.) it is established and kept together by order. This view however, while it brings them both into the system as essential to its perfection, does not place both upon the same level of importance. And we conceive that our Reformers judged wisely, not only in apprehending the two-fold connection, but, while they insisted on the substantial value of the order, admitting the paramount importance of the doctrine. Our Lord did in his own will dispense with the former (Mark ix. 38—40. Acts viii. 4. xi. 19.), never with the latter. The one may be necessary for the completeness of the Church; the other is essential to its being. How valuable is the study of Church principles in a careful comparison with Scripture; that we may obtain not only the general statement, but the proportion of its relative parts; and in the practical working of it, may learn to combine decision with forbearance, and, *without compromise of our principles*, "endeavour to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace!" See a valuable statement in Professor Scholefield's University Sermons, pp. 80—86. Comp. Dav. on Col. i. 2.

³³ Opp. xiii. p. 101.

ment,'³⁴ with which he expounds his great matter of man's complete acceptance by the righteousness of the Son of God? We confess our entire sympathy of soul with the man, who manifestly embraced this doctrine as the life-blood of his system—who lived upon it as his meat and his drink—who basked in its glowing genial warmth—and who set it forth with the splendor of a sunbeam. Fearfully indeed must the times have been altered since his time—rather since the apostolical day,³⁵ when the question is now raised, whether justification by faith is an integral part of the doctrine necessary to salvation;³⁶ nay, when it is branded as 'an hateful and unchristian heresy.'³⁷

Sacramental ordinances grounded on this unscriptural system, can, in our judgment, differ in no essential point from Romish ceremonies. The foundation of Christian doctrine solidly and broadly laid, is the only true ground, on which rightly to expound and apply those holy institu-

³⁴ Scott's Contin. of Milner, i. 243.

³⁵ See Gal. i. 6, 7. iii. 1—3.

³⁶ Froude's Remains, i. 332.

³⁷ British Critic, lxiv. p. 390. 'Lutheran' is the stigma now attached to this doctrine in Tractarian Theology. Yet Mr. Le Bas—no incompetent witness—observes in his Life of Crammer, that 'the *Articles were constructed for the most part upon the Lutheran system.*' We remark in this paragraph two instances of ignorance or perverseness, which deserve the severest reprobation. 1. The writer charges us with 'denying the essential doctrine of the Gospel—inherent righteousness;' when we hold it as strongly as himself, denying only *its justifying merit*. 2. He insists that we

tions. Remove them from their Scriptural position, and their efficacy is destroyed. They minister to self-righteousness, not to self-abasement—to “bodily exercise,” not to evangelical godliness. This system exalts ordinances, not Christ; the Church, not our glorious Head. ‘Christ,’ as Bishop Davenant again and again reminds us, ‘is the substance of the Sacraments. The virtue and operation of Christ is the very life of the Sacraments.’³⁸ ‘The true and proper use of the Sacraments,’ says Calvin, ‘is to lead us directly to Christ, and place all our confidence upon him.’³⁹ There can therefore be no life in our Ministrations, if, in this, as in every other department, Christ is not the sun of our system. The dim cloudy

‘count it the chief glory of the gospel, that under it obedience to the will of God is no longer a truth.’ This writer wholly mistakes our principles. We have no desire to rid ourselves of obedience. We feel it to be our privilege no less than our obligation. We challenge him to substantiate his assertions from any accredited evangelical writers; and till he can do this, it will be well for him to cultivate a careful regard to the ninth commandment as a proof, that ‘obedience to the will of God’ is ‘an essential and necessary truth’ *in his system*.

³⁸ On Col. ii. 11. Comp. p. 26.

³⁹ On Eph. v. 26. Bold and striking, and well worthy of our pondering, is his Exhortation to the Emperor, presented to the Diet of Spire. Speaking of the Sacraments, he complains—‘The people are presented with nothing but empty figures, with which to feed the eyes while they hear no doctrine, which might direct them to the proper end; they look no further than the external act. Hence that most pestilential superstition, under which (as if the Sacraments alone were sufficient for salvation, without feeling any solicitude about faith, or repentance, or even Christ himself) they fasten upon the sign instead of the thing signified by it.’ Tracts, (Calv. Translation Society.) i. 134.

glimpses of light, which we catch through the reflection of the Church, are but a feeble compensation for the invigorating glow of his direct rays. Let us fully honour our Divine Saviour, and largely will he honour us.

THE END.

L. SEELEY, THAMES DITTON, SURREY.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

AN EXPOSITION OF PSALM CXIX ; as illustrative of the Character of Christian Experience. 12mo. Sixteenth Edition. Price 7s. boards.

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY. With an Inquiry into the Causes of its Inefficiency ; and with an especial reference to the Ministry of the Established Church. 8vo. Sixth Edition. Price 10s. 6d. cloth.

FIFTY-FOUR SCRIPTURAL STUDIES. Eighth Edition. 18mo. 2 Vols. Price 1s. 6d. each, half-bound.

MEMOIRS OF MISS MARY JANE GRAHAM, late of Stoke Fleming, Devon. Small 8vo. Sixth Edition. With a Portrait. Price 6s.

FRIENDLY ADMONITIONS to Christian Masters, who desire to rule their households in the Fear of God. Second Edition. Price 4d. sewed.

FRIENDLY ADVICE TO SERVANTS. Third Edition. Price 1d. or 7s. per hundred.

By the same Author.

THE QUALIFICATIONS and Encouragements of the Christian Ministry. A SERMON preached in the Parish Church of Stowmarket, on Monday, May 6, 1844, at the Visitation of the Venerable the Archdeacon of Suffolk. Price 1s.

AN ADDRESS to a Young Person, on the subject of Confirmation. Thirteenth Edition. Price 3d.

ADDRESS to Young Persons *after* Confirmation. Fifth Edition. Price 3d.

THE CHURCH CATECHISM broken into easy Questions, and illustrated by Scripture Proofs. Fourth Edition. Price 6d.

AN OUTLINE of the Old Testament History, in Question and Answer, for the use of Schools. Price 9d.

LATELY PUBLISHED BY
SEELEY, BURNSIDE, AND SEELEY,
FLEET STREET.

A BELIEVER'S MANUAL.
Containing the Points of a Christian's Experience.
By the Rev. JAMES MARRYAT, B.A.
In square 16mo. Price 3s. 6d. in cloth.

CHRIST OUR LAW.
By the Author of "Christ our Example,"
In One Volume. Foolsap 8vo. Price 6s. in cloth.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.¹

I.
THE TABLE OF THE LORD.
Second Edition. In foolscap 8vo. Price 4s. 6d. in cloth.

II.
GATHERINGS.
In Foolsap 8vo. Price 4s. 6d. in cloth.

**THE LAST SCENES IN THE LIFE OF OUR LORD
AND SAVIOUR:**

A Series of Expositions on the last Chapters of St. John's Gospel.
By the Rev. D. K. DRUMMOND, Minister of Trinity Chapel, Edinburgh.
In One Volume. 12mo. Price 6s. in cloth.

CHRISTIAN TRUTH ;

A Family Guide to the Chief Truths of the Gospel ; with Forms of Prayer for each Day in the Week, and Private Devotions on various Occasions.

By the Rev. E. BICKERSTETH, Rector of Watton, Herts.

Third Edition. In Foolsap 8vo. Price 6s. in cloth.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

I.

**THE CHIEF CONCERNS OF MAN FOR TIME
AND FOR ETERNITY.**

With Additional Discourses on the Love of God, and Coming of Christ.

Fifth Edition. In Foolsap 8vo. Price 5s. in cloth.

II.

A COMPANION TO THE BAPTISMAL FONT.

Being an Abridgment of a "Treatise on Baptism."

In 18mo. Price 2s. in cloth.

III.

A SCRIPTURE HELP ;

Designed to assist in Reading the Bible profitably.

Eighteenth Edition, corrected and Enlarged, With Maps.

In Foolsap 8vo. Price 5s. cloth.

IV.

A TREATISE ON PRAYER ;

Designed to promote the Spirit of Devotion.

Sixteenth Edition, corrected and Enlarged. In Foolsap 8vo.

Price 5s. in cloth.

V.

THE CHRISTIAN HEARER ;

A Treatise designed to show the Importance of Hearing the word,
and to assist Christians to hear with profit.

In 12mo. Fourth Edition. Price 5s. boards.

SEELEY, BURNSIDE AND SEELEY,

VI.

A TREATISE ON THE LORD'S SUPPER.

In Two Parts.

Tenth Edition. Foolscap. Price 5s. in cloth.

ABRIDGED EDITIONS of the FOUR TREATISES, 6d. each,
or in One Volume, half-bound, 2s. 6d.

VII.

A TREATISE ON BAPTISM;

Designed as a Help to the due Improvement of that Holy Sacrament,
as administered in the Church of England.

In Foolscap 8vo. Price 5s. cloth.

VIII.

PRACTICAL REFLECTIONS ON THE FOUR GOSPELS.

Arranged on the plan of a Harmony.

Which leaves each Gospel in the Distinct and Original Form.

Selected from various Expositions.

Designed for the Use of Families and Schools, and for Private Edification.

Second Edition. With a Preface.

In Foolscap 8vo. Price 5s. in cloth.

PEACE FOR THE CHRISTIAN MOURNER;

Select Passages from various Authors.

Edited by Mrs. DRUMMOND.

With a Preface by the Rev. D.K. DRUMMOND, B.A.,
Minister of Trinity Chapel, Edinburgh.

In Foolscap, 8vo. Price 5s. in cloth.

APOSTOLIC INSTRUCTION EXEMPLIFIED :

An Exposition of the First Epistle of St. John.

In 12mo. 6s. cloth.

THE CENTURION :

Portraits of Roman Officers Delineated in the New Testament.

With Frontispiece. In Foolscap 8vo. Price 5s. in cloth.

FLEET STREET, LONDON.

AUGUSTINE'S CONFESSIONS.

Abridged by the Rev. E. BICKERSTETH.

32mo. Price 1s. 6d. cloth.

EXPOSITION OF PSALM CXIX.

As Illustrative of the Character of Christian Experience.

By the Rev. C. BRIDGES, M.A., Vicar of Old Newton, Suffolk.

In 12mo. Sixteenth Edition. Price 7s. in cloth.

PRINCIPALITIES AND POWERS

IN HEAVENLY PLACES.

In foolscap 8vo. Price 5s. in cloth.

REMAINS OF THE REV. RICHARD CECIL, M.A.

Thirteenth Edition, 16mo. Price 2s. 6d. cloth.

TWENTY ESSAYS ON THE PRACTICAL IMPROVEMENT OF GOD'S PROVIDENTIAL DISPENSATIONS

As Means of Moral Discipline to the Christian.

In Foolscap 8vo. Price 3s. 6d. in cloth.

"The work of a thoughtful and amiable mind, and written in a very agreeable style."—*British Magazine*.

A CHILD OF LIGHT WALKING IN DARKNESS;

A Treatise, shewing the causes, Circumstances, and purposes for which God leaves his children to Distress of Conscience.

With directions how to walk, so as to be relieved from such a condition; and some observations on Isaiah L. 10, 11.

By THOMAS GOODWIN, B.D.

Sometime President of Magdalen College, Oxford.

Price 3s. 6d. cloth.

SEELEY, BURNSIDE AND SEELEY,

JONAH'S PORTRAIT:

or, various Views of Human Nature, and of God's gracious Dealings
with Man in a fallen State.

By the Rev. THOMAS JONES, Rector of Creaton,
Eighth Edition. In Foolsap 8vo. Price 3s. 6d. in cloth.

* BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

I.

THE PRODIGAL'S PILGRIMAGE

Into a far Country and back to his Father's House. In Fourteen Stages.
Fourth Edition. In Foolsap 8vo. Price 4s. in cloth.

II.

THE SCRIPTURE DIRECTORY ;

Or, an attempt to assist the Unlearned Reader to understand the
General History and Leading Subjects of the Bible.

Eighth Edition. 12mo. Price 5s. cloth.

III.

THE CHRISTIAN WARRIOR:

Wrestling with Sin, Satan, the World, and the Flesh.

By the late Rev. ISAAC AMBROSE. Abridged, Methodized, and Improved.
In Foolsap 8vo. Price 2s. 6d. in cloth.

IV.

THE FOUNTAIN OF LIFE,

Or the Union between Christ and Believers.

Second Edition. In Foolsap 8vo. Price 4s. 6d. cloth.

V.

THE TRUE CHRISTIAN ;

Or the Way to have Assurance of Eternal Salvation.

Fifth Edition. In 16mo. Price 3s. 6d. in cloth.

FLEET STREET, LONDON.

HOURS OF SORROW ;

Or, Thoughts in Verse ;

Chiefly adapted to Seasons of Sickness, Depression, and Bereavement.

Second Edition. Corrected. In 16mo. Price 2s. 6d. in cloth.

THE CHRISTIAN VISITOR ;

Or Select Portions of the Scriptures with Expositions and Prayers.

Designed to assist the Friends of the Poor and Afflicted.

By the Rev. W. JOWETT, M.A.

Volume I. Genesis to Job. .

———— II. Psalms to Malachi.

———— III. The Four Gospels.

———— IV. The Acts and Epistles.

In Foolschap 8vo. Price 3s. 6d. each, in cloth.

LETTERS TO AN AGED MOTHER.

By A CLERGYMAN.

In Foolschap 8vo. With Engraved Title. Price 5s. in cloth.

THE GOSPEL OF THE OLD TESTAMENT ;

An Explanation of the Types and Figures by which Christ was exhibited
under the Legal Dispensation.

Re-written from the original Work of SAMUEL MATHER.

By the Author of "The Listener," &c.

In Two Vols. 12mo. Price 9s. in cloth.

MINUTIÆ ;

Or, Little Things For Christ's Flock.

365 daily Meditations on Scriptural Subjects.

By the Rev. J. W. PEERS, LL.D. Rector of Morden, Surrey.

Third Edition, much enlarged from the Author's Manuscripts.

12mo. Price 5s. cloth.

SEELEY, BURNSIDE AND SEELEY,

THOUGHTS ON RELIGION.

By BLAISE PASCAL.

AND PRIVATE THOUGHTS ON RELIGION.

By the Rev. THOMAS ADAM.

In foolscap 8vo. Price 5s. in cloth.

SELECTIONS FROM THE WORKS OF AMBROSE SERLE.

In Foolscap 8vo. Price 5s. in cloth.

LETTERS TO A FRIEND ;

Whose mind had long been harassed with many Objections to the
Church of England.

By the Rev. A. S. THELWALL, of Trinity College, Cambridge.

In Foolscap 8vo. Price 5s. 6d. in cloth.

WALKS AND SCENES IN GALILEE, JUDEA, &c.

In Foolscap 8vo. Price 3s. in cloth.

THE DIVINE ATTRIBUTES.

As they may be contemplated by the Christian, selected from Charnock,
Goodwin, Bates, and Wisheart.

By the Rev. W. WILSON, D.D., Vicar of Holy Rhood, Southampton.

Price 5s. in cloth.

A MANUAL OF THE BOOK OF PSALMS ;

Or, The Subject-Contents of all the Psalms.

By MARTIN LUTHER.

Now first translated into English, by the Rev. HENRY COLE, late of
Clare Hall, Cambridge. In Foolscap 8vo. Price 5s. in cloth.

FLEET STREET, LONDON.

CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY ;

Translated from the Latin of BENEDICT PICTET.

By FREDERICK REYROUX, B.A. In Foolsap 8vo. Price 6s. in cloth.

**ELEMENTS OF
PROPHETICAL INTERPRETATION.**

By the Rev. J. W. BROOKS, Vicar of Clareboro', Retford.
In Foolsap 8vo. Price 6s. in cloth.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

A HISTORY OF THE JEWS,

From the Call of Abraham to the present time.
In Foolsap octavo. Price 6s. in cloth.

SCRIPTURE DOCTRINES ILLUSTRATED.

By Mrs. STEVENS.

Second Edition. In Foolsap 8vo. Price 3s. in cloth.

**PRESENT STATE AND PROSPECTS OF THE
WORLD AND THE CHURCH.**

By a Clergyman of the Establishment.
In Foolsap 8vo. Price 6s. in cloth.

THE TEST OF TRUTH.

By MARY JANE GRAHAM.

Sixth Edition. In Foolsap 8vo. Price 3s. in cloth.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

**THE FREENESS AND SOVEREIGNTY OF GOD'S
JUSTIFYING AND ELECTING GRACE.**

Third Edition. In Foolsap 8vo. Price 3s. in cloth.

SEELEY, BURNSIDE AND SEELEY, FLEET STREET, LONDON.

